



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

Kiddushin Daf Yud Beis

U'BEIS HILLEL OMRIM B'PRUTAH

- **R' Yosef** thought to say, that the smallest coin of any generation is what is meant by the prutah (and there is no fixed minimum that **B"H** would require). **Abaye** said, the Mishna clearly says that the value of the prutah must be one eighth of an Italian issur! And, don't say that the value given in the Mishna was for the times of Moshe Rabbeinu, because we find that **R' Dimi** held that the prutah must be worth one eighth of the Italian issur and **Ravin** held that it needs to be one sixth of the Italian issur, so we see that a certain valuation is required! **R' Yosef** responded, how will you explain the Braisa that says that you will find that there are more than 2,000 prutos in two sela'im. Now, if you are correct that a prutah cannot be worth less than one eighth of an issur, there are less than 2,000 prutos in two sela'im, so how can the Braisa say that there are more than 2,000!? A certain elder told **R' Yosef**, "I actually had a version of the Braisa that said that there are 'close to 2,000 prutos' in the 2 sela'im". Although if you do the calculation based on 8 prutos per dinar it will come out that there are only 1,536 prutos to the 2 sela'im, since it is a number greater than 1,500 the Braisa calls it "close to 2,000".
 - **Q:** The Gemara mentioned the machlokes between **R' Dimi and Ravin**. **Abaye** asked **R' Dimi**, maybe you argue in the machlokes in a Braisa where the **T"K** goes through a calculation, from which we see that there are 8 prutos to an issar, and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** goes through the calculation and determines that there are 6 prutos to an issar!? **A:** **R' Dimi** said, we both would agree with the calculation as set forth by the **T"K**. I said my view at a time when the issar had a high valuation (so there were 8 prutos per issar) and **Ravin** said his view at a time when the issar was at a lower valuation (so there were only 6 prutos to the issar). However, we both agree as to the value of the prutah.
- **Shmuel** said, if a man is mekadesh a woman with a date, even if one can buy a kor of dates for a dinar (so that the single date is clearly worth less than a prutah), she is mekudeshes, because we are concerned that the date may be worth a prutah in Madai.
 - **Q:** **B"H** in the Mishna say that it must be a prutah. If we have this concern of **Shmuel**, what was the purpose of giving the shita of a prutah!? **A:** **B"H** gave the amount needed for a definite kiddushin. **Shmuel** was saying that in that case there would be a safek kiddushin.
 - There was a person who was mekudeshes a woman with a bundle of material. **R' Simi bar Chiya** sat in front of **Rav** to determine whether it had the value of a prutah, in which case the kiddushin would be valid, or if it was not worth a prutah, in which case it would not be a valid kiddushin.
 - **Q:** According to **Shmuel** it should be a valid kiddushin in either case!? **A:** They were trying to decide if it was a definite kiddushin, not only a safek.
 - There was a person who was mekudeshes a woman with a dark blue stone. **R' Chisda** sat to determine whether it had the value of a prutah, in which case the kiddushin would be valid, or if it was not worth a prutah, in which case it would not be a valid kiddushin.
 - **Q:** According to **Shmuel** it should be a valid kiddushin in either case!? **A:** **R' Chisda** did not agree with **Shmuel**.
 - **R' Chisda** paskened that it was not worth a prutah. The woman went and accepted kiddushin from another man. The mother of the first man came to **R' Chisda** and said "although it is not worth a prutah now, it was worth a prutah on the day that it was given as kiddushin!" **R' Chisda** told her, "you are not believed to make her assur on the second man".

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** asked **R' Chisda**, there are witnesses in the town of Idis who were at the kiddushin and know that on that day the stone was worth a prutah!? **A: R' Chisda** said, right now they are not here to give testimony. In fact, we find that **R' Chanina** used this same logic to believe a woman to say that she was captured but was not violated even though there were witnesses somewhere who supposedly said she was violated.
 - **Abaye and Rava** did not agree with the halacha of **R' Chisda**. They said that **R' Chanina** said that regarding a captured woman, who we deal with leniently, because she makes herself appear ugly to her captors so that they not violate her. However, in a case like that of **R' Chisda**, there is no reason to be meikel.
 - The woman from the case of **R' Chisda** remained married to the second man and had children with him. There were some descendants from this couple remaining in Sura, and the **Rabanan** refused to marry with them. They did so not because they held like **Shmuel**, but rather because they held like **Abaye and Rava**.
 - There was a man who was mekadesh a woman with a hadas branch in the marketplace. **R' Acha bar Huna** sent the question to **R' Yosef** asking him whether the kiddushin is valid. He sent back, "give the man malkus according to **Rav**, and he needs to give a get based on **Shmuel**" (even though it is not worth a prutah here, we must be concerned for elsewhere).
 - **Rav** would give malkus to one who was mekadesh in the marketplace, to one who was mekadesh with bi'ah, to one who was mekadesh without first having an agreement with the woman to get married, to one who was mevatel a get, to one who said that he wrote a get against his will, to one who started up with the shluchim of Beis Din, to one who was in cheirem for 30 days and did nothing to correct his actions, and to a son-in-law who lived in his in-laws' house.
 - **Q:** This suggests that a son-in-law may pass by his in-laws' house, yet we find that **R' Sheishes** gave malkus to one who even passed by!? **A:** That case was different, because the mother-in-law was already suspected of zenus with that son-in-law.
 - In Nehardai they said that **Rav** only gave malkus in the case of the person who was mekadesh with bi'ah without having made an agreement to get married. **Others** say that even if an agreement was made he would give malkus to one who was mekadesh with bi'ah, because it is considered pritzus.
 - There was a person who was mekadesh a woman with a mat of hadasim. After she accepted it the people said to him "it is not worth a prutah!" He said to them, "she should become mekudeshes with the 400 zuz that is wrapped in the mat". She kept the mat with the money and said nothing. **Rava** said, the silence happened after the money was already given, and silence after the giving of the money is meaningless. **Rava** said, I can prove this from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a man gives a woman a sela to watch for him, and then changes his mind and tells her "be mekadesh to me with this sela", if it was done at the time that the money was being given, it is a valid kiddushin. If it was done after the money was given, if she consents to it the kiddushin is valid, and if she does not consent, the kiddushin is not valid. Now, "not consenting" can't mean that she actually says she doesn't want to marry him, because then even in the first case the kiddushin would not be valid. Rather, we must say that "not consenting" means she was quiet, and the kiddushin would not be valid, because silence after the giving of the money is meaningless!
 - In Pum Nahara in the name of **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua**, they asked, that the cases are different! In the case of the Braisa we can't expect her to throw the money away to show her non-consent, because since she was asked to watch the money she feels that she would be responsible if the money is lost. Therefore, she holds onto it and remains quiet to show non-consent. However, if the case of **Rava**, if she wanted to show non-consent she should have thrown the money back at him, since she wouldn't be liable for the money anyway!?

Therefore, in that case, the fact that she is quiet does show consent!? **R' Achai** said, that is no objection, because women don't know the halachos, and even in **Rava's** case she may have thought that if she throws it and it gets destroyed, she would be responsible.

- **R' Acha bar Rav** asked **Ravina** how to pasken in such a case. He answered, we have never heard the objection of **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua**. However, since you have, you need to be concerned for it, and the woman will therefore need a divorce in a case like that of **Rava**.