



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

Kesubos Daf Mem Daled

- The Gemara brought a statement from **R' Huna** where he said that a woman who has 2 kesubos may choose which one to collect on.
 - **Q:** Should we say that he argues on **R' Nachman**, who says that if 2 deeds are produced regarding one property, the later one nullifies the earlier one? **A:** We have learned that **R' Pappa** said that **R' Nachman** would agree that if the second deed added something more than the first, that the second one is thought to be adding to, and not nullifying, the first document. In **R' Huna's** case as well, the second kesubah was for more money, and would therefore not be thought of as nullifying the first kesubah.
 - The Gemara says, according to **R' Nachman**, if the first document was a sale document and the second was a gift document, or visa-versa, we would not say that the second is nullifying the first (each one adds an aspect that the other did not have). It is when they are both sale documents or both gift documents that he says the second nullifies the first. **Rafram** said, this is so because by issuing a second document, the maker is saying that the first was invalid. **R' Acha** said, that we say the recipient may have waived any lien from the first document. The difference between these two reasons would be whether we assume the witnesses on the first document are invalid, whether the recipient must pay for any fruit eaten from the field in the time between the two documents, and who would have to pay for the taxes for this in between time.
- **Q:** What is the Halacha regarding what was discussed earlier as to whether the kesubah may be claimed from the time of eirusin or only from the time of nissuin? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel in the name of R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** said that the 100 or 200 of the kesubah may be collected from eirusin, but any amount above that will only be from nissuin. The **Chachomim** say that both can only be claimed from the nissuin.
 - The Gemara paskens that both can only be claimed from the nissuin.

MISHNA

- If a woman convert had her daughter convert with her, and the daughter was then mezaneh while a naarah and an arusah, she would get the death penalty of chenek (rather than skila), because the pasuk that requires skila suggests that it does not apply to converts. She is also not subject to the requirement that the death penalty take place at "the entrance of her father's house", and she does not get the 100 sela penalty from the husband if he was lying about the znus. However, if a girl was conceived by a non-Jewish woman and born after the mother had converted, she would be subject to skila for being mezaneh as a naarah and arusah, but would still not be included in the other 2 halachos stated above. If the girl was conceived and born to a Jewish woman, she is subject to all the halachos in the pasuk.
- If a Jewish girl who was a naarah and an arusah and was mezaneh, who has a father but whose father has no house, or if her father has a house but he has died, she would still be subject to skila, because the requirement that it take place at the entrance of the father's house is only an additional mitzvah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a naarah arusah conceived while her mother was a non-Jew and born when her mother was a Jew, who is mezaneh gets skilah? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the extra word in the pasuk "vameisah" includes such a girl for skilah.

- **Q:** If she is included in the pasuk then the husband should get malkus and have to pay 100 selah if his claim is untrue!? **A:** The word “vameisah” teaches that she is included for the type of misah, but not for the other aspects of the pasuk.
- **Q:** Maybe the extra word comes to include such a girl whose mother had converted even before her conception? **A:** Such a girl is a regular Jew and is surely included in the pasuk.
- **Q:** Maybe the pasuk comes include a girl who was born before her mother converted (and then converted herself as well)? **A:** The word of “b’Yisrael” in the pasuk excludes such a girl.
- **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, if one is motzi shem rah on an orphan he is patur from paying the penalty, because the pasuk says “v’nasnu l’avi hanaarah”.
 - **Q: R’ Yose bar Avin (or bar Zevida)** asked, **R’ Yose Haglili** says in a Braisa that the pasuk of “ihm ma’ein yima’ein aviha” comes to include an orphan as well!? **A:** He answered that the case must be where she was violated and was then orphaned.
- **Rava** said, that one who is motzi shem rah on an orphan is chayuv to pay the penalty. He learns this from a Braisa that uses a pasuk to exclude a convert (who has the status of an orphan) from this Halacha. He says, if a Jewish girl who is an orphan is not included, then there would be no reason to exclude a convert. It must be that a Jewish orphan is included.
- **Reish Lakish** says, one who is motzi shem rah on a minor is patur from paying the penalty, because the pasuk says “v’nasnu l’avi hanaarah (spelled with the “hey” at the end)”, which excludes a minor.
 - **Q: R’ Acha bar Abba** asked, without this word we would know that it doesn’t include a minor, because the pasuk says that if she was mezaneh she would be put to death, which means that it can’t be discussing a minor, because a minor is not subject to punishment!? **A:** It must be that by writing the word naarah with the “hey” in this case where it can’t be referring to a minor, the Torah is teaching that in other cases, when the word naarah is written without the “hey”, it means to include a minor as well.