



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

### Kesubos Daf Mem Ches

R' YEHUDA OMER AFILU ANI SHE'BIYISRAEL...

- **Q:** It seems that the T"K holds that these people need not be hired for the funeral of one's wife. What is the case? If it is her custom to have these, why would the T"K say they are not needed, and if it is not her custom, why would R' Yehuda say that they are needed? **A:** The case is where it is customary for someone of his status, but not for someone of her status. The T"K says, when we say that a husband must elevate his wife to his status, that is only during her lifetime. R' Yehuda says it is even after her lifetime.
  - **R' Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** paskens like R' Yehuda.
  - **R' Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** said, if a man becomes insane, Beis Din takes over his affairs and provides support for his wife, sons and daughter, and for "something else".
    - **Q: Ravina** asked R' Ashi, why is this different than the Braisa that says that one who travelled overseas without leaving support, Beis Din goes into his properties to provide support for his wife, but not for his sons, daughters, or "something else"? **A: R' Ashi** said, when one leaves intentionally without leaving support, we only do what he is obligated to do. When he becomes insane, we try and do what we think he would have wanted to do.
    - **Q:** What is meant by "something else"? **A: R' Chisda** said it refers to jewelry and perfume for his wife, and R' Yosef said 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.
  - **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of R' Huna** said, if one's wife died while he is travelling overseas, Beis Din uses his money to provide for a burial befitting for him. The Gemara explains this to mean it is befitting for her and for him. This teaches that she is elevated to his status even after her death.
  - **R' Masna** said, if a man on his deathbed says, when my wife dies do not bury her with my funds, we listen to him.
    - **Q:** After his death his funds belong to his heirs, so clearly we wouldn't use it to bury his wife. Why must he say so!? **A: R' Masna** must have meant that if one says about himself that his funds should not be used for his burial, we do not listen to him. We do not make him a public burden just because he is looking to save money for his heirs.

MISHNA

- A bride is always treated as being in the jurisdiction of her father until she enters the jurisdiction of her husband with nissuin.
- If the father gives her over to the messengers of the husband (who will take her to the husband's house), she is considered to then be in the husband's reshut. If the father went along with them, or if the father's messengers went along with them, she remains in her father's reshut. If the father's messengers give her over to the husband's messengers, she is then in the husband's reshut.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** What is meant by the Mishna when it uses the word “always”? **A:** This comes to argue on an earlier Mishna that says that if the time for nissuin arrived and the nissuin did not take place, the husband must support her, and if he is a Kohen she may eat terumah. Our Mishna is teaching that she may not eat terumah until she actually enters her husband’s reshus.

## MASSAR HA’AV LISHLUCHEI HABAAL HAREI HEE BIRSHUS HABAAL...

- **Rav** said, this puts her in the husband’s reshus in all respects, except that it does not entitle her to eat terumah if he is a Kohen. **R’ Assi** said it even allows her to begin eating terumah.
  - **Q: R’ Huna (or Chiya bar Rav)** asked **R’ Assi**, we learned that our Mishna suggests she does not begin eating terumah until she has gone to the chuppah!? **A: Rav** answered, it may be that the giving over of the girl to the husband’s messengers is treated the same as if she is given to the chuppah.
  - **Shmuel** said, the giving of the girl to the husband’s messengers is effective with regard to his inheriting her if she were to die at that point. **Reish Lakish** said, it is effective in regard to the kesubah.
    - **Q:** What is meant that it is effective in regard to the “kesubah”? **A: Ravina** said, this means that if he were to die at this point and she would get remarried, she would only be entitled to a kesubah of 100 from the next husband.
  - **R’ Yochanan and R’ Chanina** said, it is effective in all respects, including allowing her to eat terumah.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if the father accompanied the girl with the husband’s messengers, or if the father’s messengers accompanied them, or if she had a house that was along the way and the couple spent the night there, even if the dowry was already in the husband’s house, if she were to die at that point the father would inherit her. However, if she was given over by the father or his messengers to the messengers of the husband, or if the husband had a house that was along the way and the couple spent the night there with intent for nissuin, even if the dowry was still with the father, if she were to die at that point the husband would inherit her. The Braisa ends off, that this is all in regard to inheritance, but in regard to eating terumah, she may not do so until she enters chuppah. This is problematic to all views besides that of **Shmuel!**? **TEYUFTA** of all the other views.
    - **Q:** The Braisa says that if it was her house and they entered with intent to spend the night but not for nissuin, it does not effectuate a nissuin. This suggests that if no intent was had, it would effectuate a nissuin. The Braisa then says, if it was his house and they entered with intent for nissuin it effectuates a nissuin. This suggests that if no intent was had it would not effectuate a nissuin!? **A: R’ Ashi** said, both cases were without any specific intent. The Braisa is teaching that without specific intent, if it is her house we say that they don’t want nissuin to take place, and if it is his house we say that they do want a nissuin to take place.
  - A Braisa says, if the father gave her over to the husband’s messengers and she was then mezaneh, she would be put to death with chenek (as a woman who had already entered nissuin).
    - **R’ Ami bar Chama** explained, this is learned from the pasuk of “liznos beis aviha”. This girl is no longer in her father’s house and would therefore not get skila.
      - **Q:** Maybe this pasuk is teaching that a girl who has entered chuppah but did not yet have bi’ah and is mezaneh would get chenek, but not the girl described above!? **A: Rava** said we know that from the pasuk. The pasuk says “naarah besula me’orasah” would get skila – naarah teaches not to include a bogeres, besulah teaches not to include a be’ula, and me’orasa teaches not to include a nesuah. Now, a nesuah is a beula!? It must be talking about a girl who went to chuppa and did not yet have bi’ah. We see that such a girl does not get skila. The other pasuk must therefore teach regarding a girl who was given to the messengers of the husband.