<u>14.8.2</u>

(בהו עיסקא) → 80b (משנה ג׳)

Note: 'משנה ה' (below) introduces the consideration of שבח בית אביה which may refer to her rights to keep properties that are part of her paternal legacy; or it may be a consideration of honor for her family, that disposing of properties that were in their possession is a slight to their honor

- I משנה ג' disposition of assets that fall to the woman while married
 - a if it is money or פירות תלושין purchase land with the money; land is hers and he gets income
 - i if they disagree about what to buy, the priority is: (1)land, (2)house, (3)date trees, (4)fruit trees, (5)vineyards
 - b if it is פירות המחוברין:
 - i פירות setimate the added value due to פירות, that amount (only) is used to buy land as above
 - ii הרמים: entire piece becomes ורמים:
 - 1 *question*: status of fish in fishery, logs in forest could be פירות, could be קרקע, could be
 - (a) *rule*: if the branch regrows (every season) פירות, if not קרקע,
 - (i) *ruling*: if someone steals the offspring of בהמת מלוג, the כפל-payment goes to her (i.e. not "פירות")
 - (ii) *challenge*: doesn't follow הכמים OR חנניה:
 - 1. *חכמים* the offspring of בהמת מלוג belongs to him, the offspring of שפחת מלוג to her
 - a. *reason*: we are concerned that the mother (קרן=) may die (if animal dies, there's a pelt)
 - 2. *העניה* both belong to him
 - a. *nonetheless*: שבח בית אביה) agrees that at divorce, she must buy them back (שבח בית אביה)
 - (iii) *answer*: all agree that he was never granted פרי פירו פירי פירו is a ירי of the (פרי)
 - 2 *associated ruling (ר' נחמן*): if she brought in an animal or tree for its produce, he may continue using it until it dies (since it has a pelt, feathers etc. its considered קרן)
 - 3 additional ruling: if she brings in a garment, he may use it until it's tattered and she keeps tatters (קרו)
 - (a) *follows*: ruling of ר"מ contra ר"מ regarding a sulphur quarry etc.
 - iii (משנה ד') her "weakness" when marrying is her strength upon divorce (and the inverse):
 - when she marries, פירות מחוברין are his; upon divorce they are hers
 - 2 when she marries, פירות התלושין are hers; upon divorce, they are his
 - (a) difference between מירות מחוברין ורמים at time of divorce
- II משנה הו various properties that fall to her and the consideration of שבח בית אביה (see note)
 - a if elderly slaves fall to her:
 - i הרמים: sell and use the funds to buy קרקע as per above
 - ii רשב"ג: don't sell they are considered ירשבית שבח בית אביה: only if they have some value)
 - b if elderly (non-producing) olive grove or vineyard fell to her
 - i הרמים: sell and use the funds to buy קרקע as per above
 - ii תוספות) אבח בית אביה: only if they produce something)
 - c note: position of חכמים in both cases only if it isn't in her field; if it was, all agree not to sell (שבח בית אביה)

- III משנה הב: expenses and benefits of נכסי מלוג
 - a even if he expended a lot and only benefited a bit, or the opposite he has no claim nor does she
 - smallest amount:
 - 1 רבי אסי: even if the benefit was only 1 fig; בי רב אסי: even pressed dates
 - 2 question (רב ביבי): date dregs (תיקו)
 - ii *caveat:* it had to be enjoyed in a proper manner
 - 1 *question:* if not enjoyed in a מכובד manner (dispute in איסרים's worth OR איסרים) איסרים (24 איסרים)
 - b if he expended and didn't benefit at all, he swears to the value of his expenditure and claims it (upon divorce)
 - i *report*: (דייני פומבדיתא): רב יהודה ruled that the husband had benefited when he fed some vines to his animal
 - 1 Reason: רב יהודה is consistent he rules that devouring prohibited items is still a חזקת ראיה
 - ii *Ruling*: caring for his minor wife's property was deemed to be parallel to caring for another's
 - 1 *Meaning*: even if he benefits, he can still claim the expenditures (minus the benefit)
 - 2 *Reason*: to make sure that he doesn't neglect the property
 - iii Story: woman inherited 400, husband spent 600 to retrieve it; spent 1 m on the way
 - 1 Suggested ruling: (ר' אמי) considered spending, loses all of his expenditures
 - 2 *Retort*: since he spent of the capital, not considered an expenditure (אמי) agreed)
 - c *Caveat*: only if the expenditure was more than the appreciation he only gets the appreciation-value
 - Question: what if the husband has a share-cropper work the wife's field, and he benefits
 - 1 *Answer*: if the husband is an אריס, they lose their claim with him; otherwise, it is a standard deal
 - ii *Question*: if husband sells land for פירות, is it a valid sale or not?
 - 1 *Reason*: Perhaps his rights are only to increase food in the house
 - 2 *Contrary* (*ר' יהודה בר מרימר*): inferred from a ruling of רבא :
 - (a) *Case*: a woman brought 2 slavegirls into the marriage; husband married a second wife and took one of the slaves to serve the 2nd wife; 1st wife complained to רבא and he ignored her
 - (i) Assumption: because husband may sell פירות for פירות
 - (ii) *Reality*: because it increases רווח ביתא
 - iii *Final ruling*: his sale is null and void
 - 1 Suggested reason #1 (רבא): his rights are only to increase פירות in the house
 - 2 Suggested reason #2 (אביי): to ensure that he (buyer) doesn't neglect her field
 - 3 Split the difference:
 - (a) 1: if the field is nearby (she can keep an eye on its care)
 - (i) only רבא would negate the sale
 - (b) 2: if the husband is an אריס (he himself looks after the land and delivers the buyer) to the buyer)
 (i) only רבא would disallow
 - (c) 3: if the husband trades with the purchase money
 - (i) רבא would allow