



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

Kesubos Daf Mem Tes

- **Q:** Maybe we should say that if after having been given over to the husband's messengers she is for some reason brought back to her father's house, the girl returns to the reshus of the father?
A: Rava said, **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that learns from a pasuk that such a girl is considered to be removed from her father's reshus entirely and forever with regard to annulling vows. We can learn from here that the same would apply to all other aspects of her relationship with her father as well.
- We had previously stated a Braisa that says that a naarah arusah who was given over to the messengers of the husband and was then mezaneh will be put to death with chenek rather than skila. **R' Pappa** says that there is a Mishna that says this as well. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says that there is another Mishna which teaches this as well.

MISHNA

- A father is not obligated to support his daughter while he is alive. **R' Elazar ben Azarya** darshened to the **Chachomim**, in the kesubah it says "the sons shall inherit and the daughters shall be supported" – this compares the two and teaches that just as the sons don't inherit until after the father's death, so too the daughters are not supported until after the father's death.

GEMARA

- The Mishna suggests that although one is not obligated to support his daughter, he is obligated to support his son. The Mishna also suggests that although one is not obligated to support his daughter, it would be a mitzvah to do so.
 - **Q:** Based on the above, the Mishna seems to follow neither **R' Meir** (who says in a Braisa that it is a mitzvah to support one's daughters, and surely one's sons since they learn Torah), **R' Yehuda** (who says that it is a mitzvah to support one's sons, and surely one's daughters since it is disgraceful for them to have to go and beg), nor **R' Yochanan ben Broka** (who says that there is not even a mitzvah to support one's sons or daughters during his lifetime)!? **A:** We can say that the Mishna is following **R' Meir**, and the Mishna means to say that there is no chiyuv to support a daughter, and the same would apply to a son, but there is a mitzvah to support a daughter, and surely a mitzvah to support a son (he learns Torah), and the reason the Mishna discusses a daughter is to teach that there is a mitzvah to support a daughter. We can also say that the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, and the Mishna means to say that there is no chiyuv to support a daughter, and the same would apply to a son, but there is a mitzvah to support a son, and surely a mitzvah to support a daughter (it is disgraceful for her to have to beg), and the reason the Mishna discusses a daughter is to teach that there is a no chiyuv to support a daughter (even though it is disgraceful for her to beg). We can also say that the Mishna follows **R' Yochanan ben Broka**, and the Mishna means to say that there is no chiyuv to support a daughter, and the same would apply to a son, and there is similarly not even a mitzvah to support either one of them. The reason the Mishna discusses the daughter is to teach that even though there is a chiyuv to support her after the death of the father, during his lifetime there is no chiyuv.
- **R' Illa in the name of Reish Lakish in the name of R' Yehuda bar Chanina** said, they instituted in Usha that one must support his minor sons and daughters.
 - **Q:** Do we pasken like that? **A:** We find that when a father who did not support his children was brought to **R' Yehuda**, he would try and embarrass them into doing so, but

he would not force them. We find that **R' Chisda** would do the same. We find that **Rava** would do the same.

- We only do not force the father if he is not wealthy. If he is, we force him to support his children.
- **R' Illa in the name of Reish Lakish** said, they instituted in Usha that if one gifts all his possessions to his children, he and his wife are to be supported by them.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** (or **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini**) asked, we find that when a man dies and leaves over a wife and married daughter, in which case the husband of the daughter is treated like a purchaser of the estate, the **Chachomim** said that the widow is supported from the estate. If so, it should be obvious that the father who gifted the property should have himself and his wife supported from the property!? **A:** We would think that in that case, since the husband has died, there is no one to provide for the widow and that is why we allow it. However, we would think that in the case where he gifted the property, since he is around to earn money to provide for them, we should not allow them to be supported from the property. **R' Illa** therefore teaches that they are supported from the property.
 - **Q:** Does the Halacha follow **R' Illa**? **A:** We find an incident where **R' Yonason** forced the children who were gifted the property to support their father. If the Halacha followed **R' Illa** there would be no reason for him to have to force them. It must be that the Halacha does not follow **R' Illa**.