



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Kesubos Daf Kuf Zayin

MI SHEHALACH L'MEDINAS HAYAM

- **Rav** said we do seize assets from a husband who has travelled abroad, and use the assets to feed his wife. **Shmuel** says we do not. **Shmuel** said, **Rav** agrees with me that we would not seize any assets for the first 3 months of his absence, because a man does not leave his house empty, and he surely must have left over money for her to use.
 - If there are rumors that he has died, all agree that we would seize assets to feed her. The machlokes is where there are no such rumors. In that case **Rav** says we feed her from the assets, because he is obligated to feed her, and **Shmuel** says we do not.
 - **Q:** Why does **Shmuel** say that we do not use the assets to feed her? **A: R' Zvid** said, because we are concerned that he left her money that we are not aware of. **R' Pappa** said, we are concerned that he told her to keep her earnings and use it for her support.
 - The difference between these reasons would be where the wife is an adult (so he may have given her bundles of money), but is not able to support herself with her earnings (so she would not have agreed to keep her earnings instead of being supported), or where she is a minor who could support herself.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna had a machlokes regarding whether a wife whose husband travelled overseas must swear before seizing assets for support. It seems that all agree that she can seize the assets, since the machlokes is only regarding the oath!? **A: Shmuel** will say that the Mishna is referring to where there were rumors that the husband had died.
 - **Q:** A Braisa brings a machlokes regarding whether a wife whose husband travelled overseas must swear before seizing assets for support. It seems that all agree that she can seize the assets, since the machlokes is only regarding the oath!? **A: Shmuel** will say that this Braisa is also referring to where there were rumors that the husband had died.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a husband travelled overseas and when he returned he told his wife, use your earnings for your support, he may do so. If Beis Din had seized assets for her support in the meantime, what is done is done. We see that they may seize assets!? **A:** Here too, it is referring to a case where there were rumors that he had died.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a husband travelled overseas and the wife goes to Beis Din and demands support, Beis Din may seize assets for her support, but not for the support of his children, and not for "something else". We see they may seize assets!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa is discussing where he had appointed someone to support his wife and that person is not doing his job. In that case there is no reason to think that he left her any other means of support, and therefore they may use his assets for her support.
 - **Q:** If so, why don't they also support his children? **A:** The case is where he set up a person to support his wife, but not for his children.
 - **Q:** Why would we assume that the case is such? **A: R' Pappa** said, the case must be where there is a rumor based on a single witness, that the husband has died. Therefore, the wife, who may even get remarried based on a single witness, is entitled to support. The children, who may not inherit based on the testimony of a single witness, are not entitled to support based on that one witness.
 - **Q:** What is meant by "something else"? **A: R' Chisda** said it refers to jewelry and perfume for his wife, and **R' Yosef** says it refers to tzedaka.

- According to **R' Chisda**, if we don't give the wife these items when he is travelling, we certainly will not give tzedaka from his money. According to **R' Yosef**, although we don't give tzedaka from his money, we would give his wife these items, because we assume that he does not want his wife to become disgusting.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that if a yavam runs away, the yevama is supported from his assets!? **A:** **Shmuel** will say that the case of a yavam is different. They do not feel close, and therefore there is no concern that he left her money to support herself. Also, he has no right to her earnings, and therefore there is no concern that he told her to keep them for support.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a couple were travelling together overseas and the woman returns and says that she was divorced, she is not believed (we need 2 witnesses), and may collect support from his assets up to the value of her kesubah. We see that she is supported by seizing his assets!? **A:** This Braisa is also talking about where there is a rumor that he had died (before the alleged divorce).
 - **Q:** If so, why is she limited in her support to the amount of her kesubah? **A:** Since she claimed to be divorced, she has caused herself the loss and limited herself to the amount of the kesubah.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a man was married to a minor and travelled overseas, and she borrowed money for her support and then did mi'un, he is not obligated to pay back the money she borrowed. This suggests that a wife who didn't do mi'un would be entitled to have her husband pay for her support in his absence!? **A:** **Shmuel** would say, in that case there is no concern that would prevent us from supporting her. She is a minor so there is no concern that he gave her a bundle of money for support. Also, since she is a minor, it is likely that any earnings she has will be insufficient to support herself with.
- **Q:** How do we pasken? **A:** **R' Dimi** said that in practice **Rebbi** gave a wife support in this situation, but that **R' Yishmael** did not. **Ravin** said that it was **R' Yishmael** who in practice gave a wife support in this situation and it was **Rebbi** who did not.
 - The Gemara paskens like **Rav**, that we do give the wife support from the assets of her husband in his absence.
 - The Gemara paskens like **R' Huna in the name of Rav**, who said that a woman may tell her husband, I don't want your support and I will keep my own earnings.
 - The Gemara paskens like **R' Zvid**, who said that earthenware keilim that are coated with white or black metallic glaze are mutar and are not considered to absorb into the keilim. If a green glaze was used, it is assur (because it contains something that does allow substances to absorb into the keili itself). However, if the glazing has cracks, then no matter what type of glazing is used, it is assur.