



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

### Kesubos Daf Nun Gimmel

- **Q: R' Yeimar Saba** asked **R' Nachman**, if a woman sells her rights to the kesubah to her husband, does she still retain the right to the kesubas b'nin dichrin? **Rava** said, you should ask the question regarding a woman who is mochel her kesubah (which is a more common occurrence). **R' Yeimar** said, I have asked in the case of a sale, which we would say that she was forced to do for the money, and that's why I had my question. However, when she is mochel and was not forced, she would clearly lose her rights to the b'nin dichrin. **A: Rava** said, it is obvious to me that when a woman sells her kesubah to other people, that is done out of financial pressures and she therefore retains the b'nin dichrin, and when she is mochel it to her husband she loses the b'nin dichrin.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, if a woman sells her kesubah to her husband, is that treated like a sale to someone else or as if she is being mochel to the husband? **A: Rava** later answered that it is treated as if she sold it to someone else.
    - **Q: R' Idi bar Avin** asked, a Mishna teaches that when a woman gets married based on a single witness' testimony that her husband died and the husband then appears, she must get divorced from both husbands, loses her kesubah, and none of the heirs inherit her kesubah. **R' Pappa** explained that this second mention of the kesubah refers to the fact that she loses the rights to the b'nin dichrin. **R' Idi** therefore asks, we can say that she was forced into this because of the desire to get money, and we see that she still loses the b'nin dichrin, so the same should be when she is forced to sell for money!? **A:** That Mishna is based on a penalty, and therefore no proof can be brought from there.
- **Ravin bar Chanina** said in the name of **R' Elazar**, if a woman is mochel her kesubah to her husband, she is not entitled to support as a widow. **R' Chisda** told him, if you would not have said that in the name of a great person, I would have disagreed.
- A husband once came and asked whether he is chayuv to bury his arusah who had died. The **Rabanan** who were there told him he must bury her or pay her kesubah. **R' Chiya** said to them, we have learned a Braisa that teaches that one does not inherit his arusah, and as such would not have the chiyuv to bury her either.
  - **Ravin in the name of Reish Lakish** said, an arusah does not have the right of burial by her husband. **Abaye** said, this Halacha was already told to us by **R' Hoshaya**.

B'NAN NUKVAN D'YEHEVYAN LEICHI MINAI...

- **Rav** taught the Mishna that the daughters are supported until they marry, and **Levi** taught that it is until they become a bogeres.
  - The Gemara says, all agree that marriage or bogeres stops the support. The machlokes is regarding an arusa who is not a bogeres. **Rav** would hold the support would stop and **Levi** would say it continues until nissuin or bogeres.
    - We find this machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Elazar** in a Braisa as well.
  - **R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that they are supported until they are in a state of marriage.
    - **Q:** Does this refer to eirusin or nissuin? **A: TEIKU.**
  - **R' Chisda** asked **R' Yosef**, did you hear from **R' Yehuda** whether a daughter who became an arusah still gets support from her father's estate? He answered, that I have not heard, but logic dictates that she is no longer supported, because her husband will certainly not allow her to go around begging, and will provide for her. **R' Chisda** said, logic would dictate that she should get supported, because her husband, who is still unsure whether to take her in nissuin, will not yet be willing to support her!
    - Another version has the logical arguments reversed as to who said them.

- **Q:** They asked **R' Sheishes**, does a girl who did mi'un receive support from her father's estate?  
**A:** He answered, that there is a Braisa in which the **T"K and R' Yehuda** argue, but seem to be saying the same thing. The machlokes can be understood as being whether a girl who has done mi'un would be supported by her father's estate. We see that this question is a machlokes among Tanna'im.
- **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, does the daughter of a yevama from the yavam get supported from her father's estate? Do we say that since the yevama is supposed to collect her kesubah from the first husband's estate, the same would be for this daughter, or do we say that since the yevama collects from the yavam if the first husband had no estate, this daughter collects from him as well? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, does the daughter of a marriage which was assur as a shniya get supported by her father's estate? Do we say that since the mother doesn't get a kesubah the daughter doesn't get supported, or do we say that the mother is penalized because she did something wrong, but the daughter is not penalized? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Rava** asked, does the daughter of an arusah (from an illicit bi'ah with her arus) get supported by her father's estate? Do we say that since the mother has a kesubah the daughter is entitled to support, or do we say that since kesubah was really instituted for after nissuin, this daughter does not get supported? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, does the daughter of a woman who was violated get supported (the mother was violated as a naarah and then married the violator)? The question is according to the **Rabanan** who says that this woman does not get a kesubah (she got the penalty payment in its place) since he may not divorce her in any case. Do we say that the daughter therefore will not get supported either, or not? **A: TEIKU.**