



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

### Kesubos Daf Nun Ches

R' TARFON OMER NOSNIN LAH HAKOL TERUMAH...

- **Abaye** said, the machlokes is when the daughter of a Kohen is marrying a Kohen. However, when it is a Yisraelis who is marrying a Kohen, all would agree that he must give her at least 50% of her support not in the form of terumah. **Abaye** also said, the machlokes is only regarding an arusah. However, regarding a nesuah all would agree that he must give her at least 50% of her support not in the form of terumah.
  - A Braisa brings the machlokes between **R' Tarfon** and **R' Akiva** and qualifies it the way that **Abaye** qualified it. The Braisa then brings the shita of **R' Yehuda ben Beseira**, that he may give her 2/3 terumah and 1/3 not terumah. **R' Yehuda** says he may give her all terumah, and she then sells it and buys non-terumah items with the money. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, when she is given terumah it must be in double the amount that she would have gotten of non-terumah.
    - The difference between the last 2 shitos is that **R' Yehuda** would say that she must go and look for the best price for the terumah so that she can have enough money to buy what she needs. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that we give her a lot more terumah to allow her to be able to set the price very low and make a quick sale, and still be able to make enough money to support herself.

HAYAVAM EINO MA'ACHIL B'TERUMAH

- This is based on the fact that only the "kinyan kaspoo" of a Kohen may eat terumah, and this woman is the kinyan kaspoo of his brother, not his own.

ASISAH SHISHA CHADASHIM BIFNEI HABAAL

- **Q:** If we said that even when she was 12 months with the husband she does not get to eat terumah, then surely if she spent 12 months with the yavam she would not be allowed to eat terumah, so why the need to mention that case? **A:** The Mishna is saying "zu v'ein tzarich lomar zu" – it mentions it although there is no real need to mention it.

ZU MISHNA RISHONA...

- **Q:** Why did the later Beis Din say that she cannot eat terumah until she enters chuppah? **A: Ulla or R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** said, we are concerned that he will find a mum that will retroactively nullify the kiddushin.
  - **Q:** According to **Ulla** the change in Halacha is understandable, because originally the only reason an arusah did not eat terumah from her husband the Kohen was that she may give the terumah to her siblings, but once the 12 months arrived, she would be given a designated area to be supported and that concern was no more. However, the later Beis Din said that we have to be concerned for a mum, and they therefore changed the Halacha. However, according to **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda**, who says that the concern with any arusah is based on a mum, why did the Halacha change between the earlier and the later Beis Din? **A:** The earlier Beis Din held that an examination done by his female relatives removes the concern of mum, whereas the second Beis Din held that it does not remove the concern.

MISHNA

- If a man declares that his wife's bare minimum earnings (the minimum amount that she must earn) are to be hekdesh, it is not effective and she may keep the earnings for support. If he declares the amounts above the minimum amount to be hekdesh, **R' Meir** says it becomes hekdesh and **R' Yochanan Hasandler** says it does not become hekdesh.

## GEMARA

- **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, a woman may tell her husband, I will not take support from you and you will not get my earnings.
  - He holds that the main institution was to support the wife, and the earnings are given to the husband so that he not hate her for earning money while he is supporting her. Therefore, if she doesn't want to get supported, she may say so and keep her earnings.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Rabanan** instituted her getting supported in return for her giving him her wages, not the other way around!? **A:** Change the words of the Braisa to read the reverse.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the husband cannot be makdesh her minimum required earnings. Presumably this is referring to where he is willing to support her, and still she may say that she doesn't want the support and therefore keeps her earnings. This is a proof to **R' Huna!** **A:** The Mishna may be talking about a husband who is not able to support his wife. However, in a case where the husband can, it may not be up to the wife to say that she doesn't want to be supported.
    - **Q:** If the case is where she is not being supported, it is obvious that she would keep her own earnings!? **A:** That part of the Mishna is obvious. It is the next part of the Mishna which is the chiddush – the Mishna says that regarding amounts earned over the minimum required amount **R' Meir** says it becomes hekdesh and **R' Yochanan Hasandler** says it remains chullin.
  - **R' Huna** must argue on **Reish Lakish**, because **Reish Lakish** says that the reason **R' Meir** says it becomes hekdesh is not because a person can be makdesh something which has not yet come into this world, rather it is because he holds that since the husband can force the wife to give him her earnings, he can be makdesh them.
    - **Q:** We find that **R' Meir** does hold that one can be makdesh something which is not yet in the world!? **A:** We see from other places that he does, but **Reish Lakish** was saying that from our Mishna there is no proof that he holds that way, because his reasoning may be based on something else.

## HAMOSAR R' MEIR OMER HEKDESH

- **Q:** At what point does it become kodesh? **A: Rav and Shmuel** both say that it becomes kodesh after her death, when the husband inherits it. **R' Ada bar Ahava** says it becomes kodesh as soon as she makes this excess.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if the case is that she is being supported as she should be, then why would the excess money first become kodesh after her death? If the case is that she is not being supported as she should be, why would the money become kodesh as she makes the excess? **A:** A husband is supposed to give his wife support and give her an additional me'ah for her needs. The case here is where he gave her the support without the additional me'ah. **Rav and Shmuel** hold that the **Rabanan** instituted support in exchange for her basic earnings and the me'ah in exchange for her excess earnings. Therefore, since he did not give her the me'ah, she does not need to give him the excess earnings. **R' Ada bar Ahava** holds that the support is in exchange for the excess and the me'ah is in exchange for the basic earnings. Therefore, since he gives her support, the excess earnings are his.
    - The base of the machlokes is that **Rav and Shmuel** say the **Rabanan** instituted the exchange of something that is common for something that is common. **R' Ada bar Ahava** says that the **Rabanan** instituted something of a fixed amount for something of a fixed amount.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that support was instituted in exchange for her earnings, which seems to mean her basic earnings!? **A:** The Braisa means to say the "excess of the earnings".
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, if the husband does not give his wife the me'ah, her earnings belong to her? **A:** Understand this to mean the excess of her earnings.