

All אשקי אשקויי etc.

כל¹ אשקי אשקויי כולי –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited three (nearly) identical cases where it was ruled that she is not מקודשת (two by רב חמא² [and one by רב זביד]). Our תוספות explains the need for the גמרא to record these three cases.

הנך תלת עובדי איצטריך לאשמועינן דבשום דבר אין מועיל³ –

It was necessary for the גמרא to mention these three occurrences, to teach us that these expressions are **ineffective in any situation** and she will not be מקודשת -

לא במידי דאכילה ושתיה ולא בשאר מיילי⁴:

Neither by matters concerning eat or drink nor by all other matters.

SUMMARY

The need for an item does not lead us to conclude that she is accepting it for the sake of קידושין; there needs to be stronger evidence.

THINKING IT OVER

Why would we not be able to derive either of these three from the other (two)?⁵

¹ This תוספות ד"ה ה should (seemingly) precede the previous תוספות.

² Perhaps this explains why תוספות comment is on אשקי אשקויי the second repetitive ruling by רב חמא. (The ruling of רב זביד may be mentioned to inform us that he too agrees with רב חמא. However, why is the ruling of רב חמא mentioned twice?!)

³ One might differentiate and argue that by certain vital necessities (whether it is food, drink, or other items [as the situation dictates]) the woman is agreeing to the קידושין. All types of needs are mentioned so we should not distinguish between them.

⁴ The ineffectiveness concerning food is derived from the story with the dates; drink from the story with the wine; and other matters from the story with the beads.

⁵ See נה"מ.