



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

### Kesubos Daf Ayin Aleph

R' YEHUDA OMER B'YISRAEL CHODESH ECHAD...

- **Q: R' Yehuda** seems to be saying the same thing as the T"K? **A: Abaye** said, the difference is only in regard to when the husband is a Kohen. **Rava** said, the difference is when there is a month of 29 days – according to **R' Yehuda** this is the month, whereas according to the T"K he always has 30 days.
- **Rav** said, we only allow him to remain married when he specifically stated that the vow should be for 30 days. However, if he assigned no time limit, we make him divorce her immediately. **Shmuel** said, that even when he gave no time limit, we allow him to remain married for 30 days, because he may find a way to annul the vow within 30 days.
  - **Q: Rav and Shmuel** argued on this exact point regarding a vow that he would not have tashmish with his wife, so why the need to restate here as well? **A:** If we would only say the machlokes in that case, we would say only in that case **Rav** says he must immediately divorce her, because no one else can stand in his place and have tashmish with her. However, in the case of support he can appoint someone to support her in his place, and maybe **Rav** would therefore agree with **Shmuel**. If we would only say the case of support, we would think that **Shmuel** holds that way only there, because he can put someone in his place. Therefore, both cases are needed.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that if one vows to prohibit his wife from a particular fruit, he must divorce her immediately. According to **Rav** we can say that the case of support is where he gave a time limit, but in this case he did not, which is why he must divorce her immediately. However, according to **Shmuel**, why must he divorce her immediately? **A:** The case is where she made the vow and he confirmed it. Since she made the vow and is now demanding a divorce, there is no reason to think she will get it annulled, and that is why the divorce must take place immediately. We must say that **R' Meir** holds that since he confirmed the vow, he is considered to have caused it, and as such is responsible to pay her the kesubah.
    - **Q:** A Braisa brings a machlokes between **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** on the one hand, and **R' Yose and R' Elazar** on the other hand, where **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** say that even when a husband confirms his wife's vow of nezirus it is considered to be the wife that causes it and he may therefore divorce her without having to pay for her kesubah!? **A:** We must reverse the shitos.
      - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yose** says that he must divorce her and pay the kesubah, so it must be that he too considered him to be the cause when he confirms her vow!? **A:** It must be that it is **R' Meir and R' Yose** who are paired and hold that he is considered to be the cause and it is **R' Yehuda and R' Elazar** who are paired and hold that he is not considered to be the cause.
      - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yehuda** says that he must divorce her and pay the kesubah, so it must be that he too considered him to be the cause when he confirms her vow!? **A:** It must be that it is **R' Meir, R' Yose, and R' Yehuda** who hold that he is considered the cause, and it is only **R' Elazar** who argues and says that he is not at fault. **A2:** We can say that **R' Meir** holds that he is not considered to be at fault, and we will then say that our Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Meir**.
    - **Q:** According to **Shmuel's** understanding, the Mishna's later cases are discussing where the wife made the vow and the husband confirmed them by not

nullifying them. This would mean that **R' Yose** holds that the husband could have annulled the vow of a wife who vowed not to use perfume. However, in a Braisa **R' Yose** says that such a vow could not be annulled by the husband!? **A:** Our Mishna is referring to a vow that she will not use cosmetics that allow them to have tashmish. Such a vow may surely be annulled by the husband.

- **Q:** This answer doesn't work according to **R' Ada bar Ahava**, who says that this vow could not be annulled by the husband!? **A:** The case is that she vowed not to use cosmetics and vowed that if she does she should be assur to have tashmish. This clearly affects the husband, and he would therefore surely be able to nullify it.
- **Q:** Why can't she just not use the cosmetics and in that way remain mutar to the husband? **A:** People will begin calling her disgusting, so eventually she will use the cosmetics.
- **Q:** If this is the case, why does the **T"K** say that she must get divorced immediately? Why don't we wait until she uses the cosmetics, and when she becomes assur he will have to divorce her within 2 weeks according to **B"S**, or within a week according to **B"H** (as in the Mishna earlier where he promised not to have tashmish with her)!? **A:** That is only true when he makes the vow, because she is not sure she wants to get divorced, because she thinks that he may calm down. However, when she made the vow and he didn't annul it, she sees that he really hates her and therefore can demand an immediate divorce.

**R' YOSE OMER BA'ANIYOS SHELO NOSSAN KITZBAH**

- **Q:** How much may the time limit be? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, 12 months. **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, 10 years. **R' Chisda in the name of Avimi** said, only until Yom Tov, because Jewish girls use cosmetics for Yom Tov.

**U'VA'ASHIROS SHLOSHIM YOM**

- **Abaye** explained, the reason for the 30 day allowance is because a cosmetic application continues to benefit the woman for 30 days.

**MISHNA**

- If a husband makes a vow prohibiting his wife to go to her father's house, if the father lives in the same city as them, he may stay married to her if the vow is for not more than one month. If it is for more, he must divorce her and pay her kesubah. If the father lives in another city, then if the vow was only for over one Yom Tov, he may remain married to her. If it was for over 3 Yomim Tovim, he must divorce her and pay her kesubah.
- If a husband makes a vow prohibiting his wife from going to a house of mourners or a wedding, he must divorce her and pay her kesubah, because he has "locked the door in front of her". However, if he made this vow because of "something else", that would be permitted and he need not divorce her.
- If the husband makes a vow on condition that she tell someone about a private thing that she had told her husband or a private thing that he had told her, or on condition that she "fill up and pour out into the garbage", he must divorce her immediately and pay her kesubah.

**GEMARA**

- **Q:** The Mishna speaks of a vow of one or 3 Yomim Tovim, but what is the Halacha if the vow included 2 Yomim Tovim? **A:** **Abaye** said, when the Mishna says that 3 would require an immediate divorce (which suggests that 2 would not) it is following **R' Yehuda**, who allows the Kohen extra time before requiring a divorce. **Rabbah bar Ulla** said, a woman who is eager to go back to her father's house may demand a divorce even for a vow that includes 2 Yomim Tovim. Otherwise, she can't do so unless it includes 3 Yomim Tovim.