



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

Kesubos Daf Mem Gimmel

- **Q: R' Avina** asked **R' Sheishes**, if a girl is being supported by her brothers from the estate of their father, who does her wages belong to? Do they take the place of the father and get her wages, or is it different because she is being supported by the father's money, not theirs, and therefore they don't get her wages!? **A: R' Sheishes** answered, a Mishna says that when a widow is supported from her husband's estate, her wages go to the husband's heirs. The same would be with the case of this girl.
 - The Gemara says, the case may be different, because a husband doesn't want his widow to profit (be supported and keep her wages) at the expense of his sons, but does want his daughter to profit in that way even at the expense of his sons!
 - **Q:** We find that a person would rather have his widow supported even if it means that his daughter would have to beg as a pauper for food. This shows that a person is more willing to see his widow profit!? **A:** A person is more concerned with the degradation of his widow than that of his daughter, but he is more willing to allow his daughter to profit than he is to allow his widow to profit.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, our Mishna says that the wages and finds that a girl earned and found, but did not collect, during her father's lifetime, go to the brothers. This suggests that wages earned after death would not go to her brothers. Presumably we are discussing a case where she is being supported, and we see that her wages do not go to the brothers!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where she is not being supported.
 - **Q:** If she is not being supported it would be clear that she need not give her wages!? **A: Rabbah bar Ulla** said, it may be that she is not being supported, and the Mishna is teaching that although we know she would get to keep what she needs to support herself, we would think that any amount above that must be given to the brothers. The Mishna tells us that she gets to keep it all.
 - **Rava** said that **R' Yosef's** proof is from the fact that the Mishna compares her wages to her finds. In doing so it teaches that just as her finds go to her father during his lifetime and to her after his lifetime, the same is with her wages (even if she is supported by the brothers).
 - We find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that a girl who is being supported by her brothers keeps her own wages.
 - **R' Kahana** said, the reason a girl keeps her own wages is based on the pasuk that says one can leave his servants as an inheritance. We learn from the pasuk that only his servants may be left as an inheritance, but his daughter (her wages) may not be left as an inheritance.
 - **Rabbah** asked, maybe the drasha from the pasuk only teaches regarding payments for injury or for her being violated, but not for her wages!?
 - **R' Zeira in the name of R' Masna** said in the name of **Rav** the same thing that **R' Yehuda** said in the name of **Rav** and gave the reasoning as given by **R' Kahana**.
 - **Avimi bar Pappi** said that **Shmuel** said this as well.
 - **Mar bar Ameimar** said to **R' Ashi** that **Nehardai** said the Halacha follows **R' Sheishes**, but **R' Ashi** said that the Halacha follows **Rav**.
 - The Gemara paskens like **Rav**.

MISHNA

- If one gave his daughter in eirusin and she was then divorced, and he then gave her in eirusin and she was then widowed, both of the kesubos belong to him. If he gave her in nissuin and she was divorced and then gave her in nissuin and she was widowed, both kesubos belong to her. **R' Yehuda** says the first kesubah belongs to the father. They said to him, once he gives her in nissuin he no longer has any jurisdiction over her!

GEMARA

- The Mishna gave the case where she was first divorced from nissuin and was then widowed. It does so, because the Mishna seems to hold that if she was widowed twice she would not be allowed to marry again. This follows the view of **Rebbi**, who says that something happening 2 times creates a chazakah.

R' YEHUDA OMER HARISHONA SHEL AV

- **Rabbah and R' Yosef** explain that **R' Yehuda** holds that the first kesubah takes effect at the time of the eirusin, when she was not yet given over in nissuin and is therefore still under the jurisdiction of her father.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says, if a father gives his daughter in eirusin as a minor, and she then becomes a bogeres and then enters nissuin, he is not entitled to her kesubah. Now, according to the explanation above, he should get the kesubah, since at the time of eirusin he was entitled to it!? **A:** It must be that **Rabbah and R' Yosef** said that he gets the first kesubah, because it was written right before the nissuin, at a time when she was still in his jurisdiction. However, in the Braisa, by the time it was written she was already a bogeres and out of his jurisdiction.
- **Q:** From when does a woman collect her kesubah from properties of her husband that were sold? **A: R' Huna** said that the main part of the kesubah (the 100 or 200 zuz) is collectible from the time of the eirusin. Any amount given above that is collectible from the time of nissuin. **R' Assi** said both are collectible from the nissuin.
 - **Q:** We have learned that if a wife produces 2 kesubos, one for 200 and one for 300, **R' Huna** said that if she wants to collect 200 she may collect from the time of the earlier dated kesubah. If she wants to collect on the 300 she must collect for the later dated document. If what we said that **R' Huna** holds above is true, then in this case as well **R' Huna** should say that she can collect the 200 from the first date and the other 100 from the later date!? **A:** Why don't we say that she can collect 200 from the first time and 300 from the second time, for a total of 500? It must be, because we assume that the husband did not mean for both to be collected, but rather to give her the choice of which one she wants to collect with. Similarly, if she chooses to collect on the 300, we don't say she collects 200 based on the first date and the other 100 based on the later date, because by choosing the 300 she is giving up the lien of the first kesubah entirely.