



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

Kesubos Daf Nun Zayin

- **R' Dimi** said that **R' Shimon ben Pazi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, the machlokes between **R' Yose and R' Yehuda** (whether the decrease to the kesubah may be made orally or must be made in writing) is only when the decrease is made in the beginning, but if the decrease were to be made at the end, all would agree that it would have to be made in writing. **R' Yochanan** says the machlokes is in both cases. **R' Avahu** said, **R' Yochanan** explained to me that he does not argue with the earlier view. When **Bar Kappara** says "in the beginning" he is referring to the beginning of chuppah and when he says "the end" he means the end of bi'ah. When I (**R' Yochanan**) said the machlokes is in both cases, I mean to say that they argue in the case of "the beginning" of chuppah and at "the end" of chuppah, which is the beginning of bi'ah.
 - **Ravin** said that **R' Shimon ben Pazi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, the machlokes between **R' Yose and R' Yehuda** (whether the decrease to the kesubah may be made orally or must be made in writing) is only when the decrease is made at the end, but if the decrease were to be made at the beginning, all would agree that it could be done orally. **R' Yochanan** says the machlokes is in both cases. **R' Avahu** said, **R' Yochanan** explained to me that he does not argue with the earlier view. When **Bar Kappara** says "at the end" he is referring to the end of chuppah and when he says "the beginning" he means the beginning of chuppah. When I (**R' Yochanan**) said the machlokes is in both cases, I mean to say that they argue in the case of "the beginning" of bi'ah and at "the end" of bi'ah.
 - **R' Pappa** said, if not for **R' Avahu**, I would have said that **R' Yochanan** is arguing with the view of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, and it is **R' Dimi and Ravin** who do not argue (**Ravin's** "end" refers to the end of chuppah, and **R' Dimi's** beginning refers to the beginning of bi'ah (which is the same as the end of chuppah). However, now that **R' Avahu** has taught that **R' Yochanan** is not arguing, it must be that **R' Dimi and Ravin** are arguing.

MISHNA

- From the time that a besulah is told by her husband to prepare for nissuin, she is given 12 months to prepare herself. Similarly, if the wife tells the husband to prepare himself for nissuin, he is also given 12 months to do so. An almanah is given 30 days. If the time was given and the nissuin did not take place, the wife is entitled to begin to be supported by the husband, and if he is Kohen she may begin to eat terumah.
 - **R' Tarfon** says a Kohen may choose to give his wife only terumah. **R' Akiva** says he may not give more than 50% terumah.
- A yavam does not entitle the yevamah to eat terumah. Therefore, if 12 months have passed from when the husband had asked her to prepare herself – whether 6 of those months were with the husband and 6 with the yavam, or whether 12 months less a day were with the yavam, or 12 months less a day were with the husband – she is still not entitled to eat terumah.
- The above was the original way that the Halacha was set. However, a later Beis Din said that the wife of a Kohen may not eat terumah until she has entered into chuppah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** From where do we learn that a woman is given 12 months to prepare for nissuin? **A: R' Chisda** said, we see this from the pasuk by Rivka, where her brother and mother said that Rivka should remain in their house for a year to prepare before going to Yitzchak.
- **R' Zeira** said, a Braisa says, in the case of a minor, she or her father may delay the wedding until she becomes an adult.

- **Q:** It makes sense that she can delay if she feels she is not ready for married life. However, if she is ready, why does it make a difference to the father? **A:** The father says that she thinks she is ready but is truly not, and will end up leaving the marriage and returning to him if she gets married before she is truly ready.
- **R' Abba bar Levi** said, we do not set a date for nissuin for a minor, but we may set a date for the minor for a nissuin that will take place when she becomes an adult.
 - **Q:** It is obvious that we may set a date for that later time!? **A:** We would think that even just setting a date will make her ill from nervousness. He therefore teaches that we may set the date.
- **R' Huna** said, if a girl became a bogeres and the next day accepted kiddushin, we give her 30 days to prepare for nissuin, like an almanah.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a bogeres is treated like a girl who has been told to prepare for her nissuin. Presumably this refers to a girl who was a besulah, and we see that a bogeres is given 12 months!? **A:** The Braisa means that she is treated like an almanah who was told to prepare for her nissuin.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that a bogeres who has waited 12 months for nissuin, **R' Eliezer** says that since the husband must support her, he may also annul her vows. We see that a bogeres is given 12 months!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to 2 cases – a bogeres **or** a girl who has waited for 12 months, because a bogeres gets only 30 days.
 - **Q:** A Brasia says, if one gives kiddushin to a besula, whether he demands nissuin and she delayed or visa-versa, we give her 12 months from the time of the demand, not just from the time of the kiddushin. A bogeres is treated like a girl who was told to prepare. How so? If she accepted kiddushin the day after becoming a bogeres, she is given 12 months. An arusah is given 30 days. Now this Braisa clearly refutes **R' Huna!** **TEYUFTA.**
 - **Q:** What is meant when the Braisa says that an arusah is given 30 days? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, it means that if a girl was a bogeres for 12 months and then became an arusah, she is only given 30 days, like an almanah.

HIGIYA ZMAN V'LO NISU

- **Ulla** explained, D'Oraisa an arusah of a Kohen may eat terumah, because she is considered the “kinyan kaspo” of the Kohen. However, the **Rabanan** were concerned that since she is living in her father's house, she may mistakenly give terumah to her brothers or sisters to eat or drink. Therefore they were goizer that she should not eat terumah as an arusah.
 - **Q:** If so, then even when the 12 months are reached she should still be assur to eat terumah!? **A:** In that case he designates a special place for her to eat the terumah, away from her family.
 - **Q:** Based on this gezeirah, a Kohen who is employed by a Yisrael should not be allowed to eat terumah, because he may give it to the Yisrael to eat!? **A:** The employer gives him food to eat. He will never give the employer food to eat.
- **R' Shmuel bar R' Yehuda** said, the reason an arusah of a Kohen may not eat terumah is because we are concerned that he will later find a mum in her that will retroactively nullify the kiddushin, and will make it that she was never his arusah and was never allowed to eat terumah.
 - **Q:** If so, then she should not be allowed to eat even after going to chuppah if he has not yet had bi'ah with her (at which time he has seen all physical defects)? **A:** Before going to chuppah, a man has his wife checked out (by his female family members) to see if there are any physical defects.
 - **Q:** Based on this gezeirah, the slave that a Kohen buys from a Yisrael should not be allowed to eat terumah, because the Kohen may find a defect and annul the sale retroactively!? **A:** Such defects do not annul the purchase of a slave retroactively. If it is an external defect, he has seen it. If it is an unexposed blemish, since it doesn't effect his work, the owner does not care. If he is found to be a thief or kidnapper, the sale is considered valid anyway. The only other blemishes would be if he is found to be an armed robber or one who has been sentenced to death by the government. Those blemishes are known.
- **Q:** What is the practical difference between the reason given by **Ulla** and the reason given by **R' Shmuel bar R' Yehuda**? **A:** The difference would be in a case where: 1) the husband agreed to accept any defect that he may find; 2) where the father gave her over to the husband's messengers; 3) where the father's messengers went along with the husband's messengers.