

בכולהו לא מנגיד רב – did not flog for all of those cases רב

OVERVIEW

Initially the גמרא stated that רב was מנגיד for various offenses; including sons-in-law who dwelt in their in-laws house (because of the suspicious relationship between the son-in-law and mother-in-law). The נהרדעי limited the scope when רב was מנגיד and excluded the case of a חמוה. Our תוספות discusses the (then) present day custom where the senior in-laws shared their dwelling with the younger couple.

על זה סומכין החתנים בזמן הזה שדרים בבית חמות –

Nowadays, the sons-in-law who live in their mothers'-in-law houses depend on this ruling of נהרדעי that רב was not מנגיד a חתן who is דר בבית חמותו –

ואפילו למאן דחייש לעיל –

And even according to the one who previously maintained that we are concerned and רב was מנגיד one who is דר בבית חמוה, nevertheless this does not apply nowadays, because –

מה שדרין עכשיו בבית חמותם היינו בשביל טובת הנאה¹ שדרים בלא שכירות בבית –
That which the חתנים live nowadays in their mothers'-in-law houses is because of a financial benefit; so that they can live rent-free –

דיש הוכחה שאינם דרים בשביל חמותם אלא בשביל שאר טובות שעושין להם:²

So there is proof that they are not living there because of a suspect relationship with their mother-in-law, but rather on account of other favors which their in-laws provide for them.

SUMMARY

Nowadays young couples (may) live with their in-laws, because [according to נהרדעי, רב was not מנגיד for this, and] today the financial benefits incurred dispels any suspicions that there may be an illicit relationship.

THINKING IT OVER

The נהרדעי (merely) state that רב was not מנגיד for a חמוה; from where does תוספות derive that it is permissible?

¹ If there is no טובת הנאה then the mere fact that they share a house arouses suspicion; however if there is a טובת הנאה, then there are no grounds for suspicion (see "עצמ").

² It would seem that according to the נהרדעי one is permitted to live by his in-laws even if he receives no benefit. See "Thinking it over".