



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

Kesubos Daf Samach Tes

- **Rav** sent a letter to **Rebbi**, and in between the lines he asked the question, whether a sister may collect a dowry from the fields of the estate that were “encumbered” by the brothers. When **Rebbi** received the question, **R' Chiya** asked him, does he mean to ask when the brothers sold the field or when they pledged the field? **Rebbi** said, it would make no difference. In either case, a dowry may be collected from them, but regular support may not.
 - **Q:** Why wasn't **Rav** clear when he asked? Why didn't he ask either regarding where it was sold or where it was pledged? **A:** **Rav** figured that by being unclear in the way that he was, he would get both cases answered.
- **R' Yochanan** argues on **Rebbi** and says that even a dowry may not be collected from encumbered properties.
 - **Q:** Did **R' Yochanan** not hear that **Rebbi** had said different, and if he would have heard he would not have argued, or did he know what **Rebbi** said and still argued? **A:** We have learned that **R' Yochanan** said that if a person leaves over 2 daughters and a son, and the first daughter gets married and takes 1/10 of the estate as her dowry, and the son then dies, when the second daughter gets married she does not get a 1/10 dowry, because the estate will be evenly split between the two girls. **R' Chanina** said to **R' Yochanan**, if a girl can collect a dowry from a field that was sold, she should surely be able to collect from her sister even if the estate is split! Now, from the fact that **R' Yochanan** did not answer back and ask – who says that a dowry is collected from sold properties – it must be that he knew that **Rebbi** said so.
 - **Q:** It may be that he did not know, and had he known he would have agreed. The reason why one daughter would not collect from the other daughter may be, because once she gets half the estate we feel she has plenty of money and need not get a separate dowry.
 - **Q:** **R' Yeimar** asked, if so, when a girl finds something of value she should also not get a separate dowry, because she has enough money!?
 - **A:** **R' Ashi** said, in the case of the splitting of the estate the money she has comes from the estate, so she is not entitled to more from the estate. The find does not come from the estate, and as such will not effect the amount that she is entitled to get from the estate.
 - **Ameimar** said, a daughter is considered to be an inheritor of 1/10 of the estate for her dowry. **R' Ashi** asked, do you mean to say that the brothers could not remove her stake in the land by giving her money? **Ameimar** said, yes. They may not give her money in place of the field, and may not even move her from one field to another.
 - **R' Ashi** said, a daughter is considered to be a creditor of 1/10 of the estate for her dowry.
 - The Gemara says that **Ameimar** eventually held this way as well, since we find that he was once silent when brothers said to their sister, if we had money for your dowry we would force you out of the field.
 - **Q:** Is she considered to be a creditor of the father or of the brothers? The difference would be that if it is of the brothers, she can collect from the average quality land and need not swear, whereas if it is of the brothers as heirs of the father, she only collects from the inferior land and must swear to collect? **A:** We find that **Ravina** allowed **R' Ashi's** daughter to collect from his sons from average land without swearing.
 - **R' Anan** sent **R' Huna** a message, addressing him without a proper title, and telling him that when a particular woman comes to him he should help her to

collect 1/10 of her father's estate for her dowry. **R' Huna** was upset that he was not properly addressed and sent a sharp message back to **R' Anan** in return.

- **Rava** paskens that money for support, for a wife's kesubah, and for a daughter's dowry are all only collected from real property, and not from moveable property.

MISHNA

- If a father gives money to a trustee to buy a field for his daughter for a dowry, and the daughter tells the trustee, I trust my husband, give him the money and let him buy the field – **R' Meir** says the trustee should not listen and must follow the instructions given by the father. **R' Yose** says, once she gets the field she can sell it if she wants, so if she is asking for the money, we just give it to her.
- This is only so for a daughter who is an adult. If a daughter is a minor, we don't listen to her at all.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one gives money to a trustee to buy a field for his daughter, and she tells the trustee to give the money to her husband, **R' Meir** says if she already entered into nissuin he should listen to her, if she had only entered into eirusin, the trustee should not listen to her. **R' Yose** says, if she was an adult, he should listen to her, if she was still a minor he should not.
 - It can't be that the difference between their views is a minor who had already entered into nissuin and **R' Meir** would say that we listen to her, because our Mishna says that "the act of a minor is nothing", and that must have been said by **R' Meir**, because **R' Yose** said we listen to her since she can anyway sell the field, but a minor can't sell a field so we wouldn't listen to her. There would be no reason for **R' Yose** to repeat that and make the statement that "the act of a minor is nothing". Based on this, the difference between the views would be a girl who was an adult and had only entered eirusin. According to **R' Meir** we would not listen to her, and according to **R' Yose** we would.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that the Halacha follows **R' Yose**, and **Rava in the name of R' Nachman** said that the Halacha follows **R' Meir**.
- A Mishna says that younger children (around the age of 8 or 9) are able to make valid purchases and sales of moveable property.
 - **Rafram** said, this is only when an administrator was not appointed for them. We see this in our Mishna, where a trustee was appointed and the Mishna says that "the act of a minor is nothing".
 - **Q:** Maybe a trustee (who is appointed for a specific task) is different than a general administrator, and the Mishna therefore can't be a proof? **A:** If that was true, the Mishna would have said "the trustee should do as he was told". From the fact that the Mishna says "the act of a minor is nothing", this teaches that even if there was an administrator the minor's act would be meaningless.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK METZIYAS HA'ISHA!