



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

Kesubos Daf Mem Zayin

B'MASSEI YADEHA

- **Q:** How do we know that a father keeps his daughter's wages? **A: R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk of "v'chi yimkor es bito l'amah" compares a daughter to a maid to teach that just as a maid's wages go to her master, so too a daughter's wages go to her father.
 - **Q:** Maybe that only applies to a minor, who the father has the right to sell, but not a naarah? **A:** If a father couldn't keep the wages of a naarah, he wouldn't be allowed to marry her off, because that would prevent her from earning money. It must be that the money would anyway go to him.
 - **Q: R' Achai** asked, maybe the father has to pay for her work stoppage when he marries her off? Or maybe he must marry her off at night when she is not working? Or maybe he may only marry her off on Shabbos and Yom Tov? **A:** We learn that a father keeps the naarah's earnings from the pasuk above. The pasuk cannot be teaching regarding a minor, because since he can sell her it is obvious that he gets her wages. The pasuk must therefore be teaching regarding a naarah.

B'HAFARAS NIDAREHA

- This is learned from the pasuk of "binureha beis aviha".

UMIKABEL ES GITA

- The pasuk compares divorce to kiddushin. This teaches that they are treated the same.

V'EINO OCHEIL PEIROS B'CHAYEHA

- A Braisa says, a father does not eat the produce of a daughter's property during her lifetime. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says he does.
 - The machlokes is, that the **T"K** holds that a husband is entitled to the produce so that he not refuse to redeem her if she is ever captured. However, a father will never hold back from doing so, so he is not given the produce. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that a father might also refuse to redeem a daughter if he is not given the produce.

NISEIS YESER ALAV HABAAL SHEHU OCHEIL...

- A Braisa says, if a father gave his daughter moveable property to take into her marriage, and the girl died before the nissuin, the husband does not get to keep these items. In the name of **R' Nosson** it was said that he does get these items.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this is the same machlokes as the one between **R' Elazar ben Azarya and the Rabanan** in a Mishna, where the **Rabanan** say that a woman who is divorced or widowed even from the eirsuin collects the full kesubah and even any additional amounts (above the 100 or 200 of a basic kesubah) that were promised, and **R' Elazar ben Azarya** says she only gets the entire amount if she had already entered nissuin, but if she had not yet done so, she is only entitled to the basic 100 or 200 of the kesubah. Maybe we can say that **R' Nosson** holds like the **Rabanan**, and the **T"K** holds like **R' Elazar ben Azarya**!? **A:** It may be that they both hold like **R' Elazar ben Azarya**, and the reason of **R' Nosson** is that the father gave those items out of happiness for having made a relationship with the husband's family. Since the relationship was made that is why he gets to keep the property.

CHAYUV BIMZONASEHA...

- A Braisa says, the **Rabanan** instituted that a husband must support his wife in return for getting her earnings, and he must pay for her burial in return for inheriting the items in her kesubah, therefore he eats the produce of his wife's property.

- **Q:** Where was produce mentioned that the Braisa ended off discussing it? **A:** The Braisa is missing a phrase and should say that they also instituted that he must ransom her in return for eating the produce of her property.
- **Q:** What is the term of “therefore” in the Braisa? **A:** We would think that we shouldn’t let him eat the produce, but should rather have him save the produce to use in case he needs to ransom her. The Braisa teaches we let eat it, because in that way, even if the accumulated produce would not be enough to ransom her, he must do so anyway.
- **Q:** Maybe the reasons given in the Braisa should be reversed? **A: Abaye** said, they instituted a common source of funds for a common need of the wife, and a less common source of funds for a less common need of the wife.
- **Rava** said, the Tanna of the following Braisa holds that the obligation to support a wife is from the Torah. The Braisa says, the pasuk that says that a husband must give his wife “she’eira” – which means support, “kesusa” – which means clothing, and “onasa” – which means bi’ah. **R’ Elazar** says “she’eira” means bi’ah, “kesusa” –means clothing, and “onasa” –means support. **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** says “she’eira kesusa” means age appropriate clothing, and “kesusah onasa” means seasonal appropriate clothing.
 - **R’ Yosef** taught a Braisa that “she’eira” means he should have bi’ah without any clothing.
 - This supports **R’ Huna** who says that if one says he will only have bi’ah with his wife while wearing clothing, he must divorce her and pay her kesubah.