



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

Kiddushin Daf Chuf Aleph

- The previous Gemara darshened a kal v'chomer to teach that a field that was given to hekdesh cannot be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed. The Gemara tried refuting that kal v'chomer and then reestablished it by saying that a house in a walled city that is sold, although it can be redeemed immediately, it may still not be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, maybe the house in the walled city is treated stringently because we find that the Torah is more stringent regarding it, in that it can only be redeemed for one year. However, a field that was made hekdesh, since it can be redeemed until Yovel, maybe it can also be redeemed with borrowed money or partially be redeemed? **A: R' Acha Saba** said to **R' Ashi**, we will learn the halacha with a tzad hashava. The common ground between redeeming a field that was sold and a house of a walled city that was sold is that they are both able to be redeemed, and neither of them could be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed. We can say that a field given to hekdesh fits into this group as well, and therefore also cannot be redeemed with borrowed money or partially be redeemed.
 - **Q: Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** asked **Ravina**, we can ask that the common ground between the sold field and the sold house is that they both cannot be redeemed in the second year after the sale (the field cannot be redeemed until after 2 years of the sale, and the house may only be redeemed in the first year), whereas a field given to hekdesh may be redeemed immediately, so maybe it can also be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed!? **A: Ravina** said, we see that an eved ivri sold to a goy may be redeemed immediately and still he may not be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed. So we see that immediate right to redemption does not allow something to be redeemed with borrowed money or be partially redeemed.
- **Q: R' Huna bar Chinina** asked **R' Sheishes**, may relatives redeem a house that was sold in a walled city or not? Do we learn the gezeirah shava of "ge'ulaso" from a sold field, and just as the field may not be partially redeemed, but may be redeemed by relatives, so too the house may not be partially redeemed, but may be redeemed by relatives, or do you say that the gezeirah shava only comes to teach regarding partial redemption, and that's it? **A:** He answered, it may not be redeemed by relatives.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of "b'chol...geulah titnu" teaches to include redemption by relatives in the case of houses and eved ivri. Presumably, this is referring to a house in a walled city, and we see that it may be redeemed by relatives!? **A:** It is referring to houses in an unwalled city.
 - **Q:** We don't need a pasuk for a house in an unwalled city, because it is clearly dealt with in the pasuk "ahl sdei haaretz yeichashev", which teaches that it is treated like a regular field!? **A:** The Braisa is following **R' Eliezer** from another Braisa where he says that the pasuk of "b'chol...geulah titnu" teaches that there is an obligation for relatives to redeem a field that was sold.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, if we say that the pasuk comes to include a house sold in a walled city, I understand the pasuk's use of the word "v'chol". However, if the pasuk is only coming to include a house in an unwalled city, why does the pasuk use the word "v'chol"? **KASHYEH.**

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, the pesukim regarding an eved ivri sold to a goy says “yigalenu” three times, to teach that all redemptions are done like this. Presumably, this means to include the redemptions of a house in a walled city and of an eved ivri sold to a Yid, that they may both be redeemed by relatives!? **A:** It comes to include the redemptions of a house in an unwalled city and of a field.
 - **Q:** Those are learned from a clear pasuk!? **A:** It is needed to teach the halacha of **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak**, that the obligation falls on the closer relative first.
 - The halacha of **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** was taught regarding the following.
 - **Q:** The question was asked, can an eved ivri sold to a Yid be redeemed by relatives according to the **Rabanan**? We have the gezeira shava of “sachir” to learn from the eved ivri sold to a goy, but maybe we also learn from “yigalenu” that relatives only redeem by the eved ivri sold to a goy? **A:** The Braisa says the pasuk of “b’chol...geulah titnu” teaches to include redemption by relatives in the case of houses and eved ivri. Presumably, this is referring to an eved ivri sold to a Yid, and we see that it may be redeemed by relatives!? **A:** It is referring to an eved ivri sold to a goy.
 - **Q:** A clear pasuk teaches that such an eved is redeemed by relatives!? **A:** The pasuk of “b’chol” teaches that redemption by relatives is an obligation.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says the pesukim regarding an eved ivri sold to a goy says “yigalenu” three times to teach that all redemptions are done like this. Presumably, this means to include the redemptions of a house in a walled city and of an eved ivri sold to a Yid, that they may both be redeemed by relatives!? **A:** It comes to include the redemptions of a house in an unwalled city and of a field.
 - **Q:** Those are learned from a clear pasuk!? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, this teaches that the obligation falls on the closer relative first.

V’HANIRTZA NIKNEH BIRTZIA

- This is based on the pasuk of “v’ratza adonav es azno bamartzei’ah...”

V’KONEH ES ATZMO BAYOVEL UVIMISAS HA’ADON

- The pasuk says “va’avado”, which teaches that he does not serve the son or daughter, and “l’olam” teaches that he serves until Yovel.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “martzeya”, which would seem to teach that only an awl (pointed tool used for making holes) may be used to pierce his ear. **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** says, the pasuk therefore says “v’lakachta” to teach that anything that can be taken in the hand may be used. **Rebbi** says, just as an awl is made of metal, so too any tool that is used for this must be made of metal. **Another** drasha is, “hamartzeya” teaches to allow the use of the large awl. **R’ Elazar** said, **Yudin Beribi** darshened, when they pierce the ear they pierce only the earlobe. The **Chachomim** say, an eved ivri who is a Kohen may not become a nirtza because it would make him a baal mum. Now, a hole in the earlobe would not make him a baal mum. It must be that they hold the piercing was done to the upper part of the ear.
 - **Q:** What is the machlokes between **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** and **Rebbi**? **A: Rebbi** darshens with a klal uprat – “v’lakachta” is a klal, “martzeya” is a prat, “b’azno uvadeles” is another klal. Therefore we have a klal, prat, uklal, in which case we can only include other items similar to the prat. Therefore, just as the prat is made of metal, so too any tool used must be made of metal. **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** darshens with a ribuy umiut – “v’lakachta” is a ribuy, “martzeya” is a miut, “b’azno uvadeles” is another ribuy. Therefore we have a ribuy, miut, v’ribuy, in which case we include all other items and exclude only one. Therefore we will only exclude making the hole using a liquid of some sort.
 - **Q:** How does the word “hamartzeya” teach to include the large awl? **A:** As **Rava** once said, that the word “hayareich” refers to the important of the thighs, so too “hamartzeya” refers to the distinguished of the awls (the large one).

- **Q:** Why do the **Chachomim** say a Kohen cannot become a nirtza because it will make him a baal mum? What is wrong with him becoming a baal mum? **A: Rabbah bar R' Sheila** said, the pasuk says “v'shav ehl mishpachto”, which teaches that he is to be returned to the full status of his family, and if he becomes a baal mum he would not be able to do the Avodah.
- **Q:** Can the master of an eved ivri who is a Kohen give the eved a non-Jewish slave to marry? Maybe he is like any other Yid and can be given one, or maybe since he has many extra mitzvos, he is not to be given such a woman as a wife? **A: Rav** said it is mutar to give him this wife, and **Shmuel** said it is assur.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** asked **R' Anan**, why didn't you ask **Shmuel**, the **Rabanan** in the Braisa said a Kohen cannot become a nirtza because it would make him a baal mum. Now, if **Shmuel** is correct, the reason he cannot become a nirtza is because he cannot say “ahavti es adoni es ishti v'es banai”!? To this question there is no answer.
- **Q:** May a Kohen marry a “yefas toar” (a non-Jewish woman that he captured at war)? Maybe he is like any other Yid and can marry her, or maybe since he has many extra mitzvos, he may not? **A: Rav** said it is mutar and **Shmuel** said it is assur.
 - All would agree that the first bi'ah with her is mutar for the Kohen, because the Torah was only matir her with realization that the yetzer harah may be too strong to fight, and a Kohen is subject to the same yetzer harah. The machlokes is only regarding the second bi'ah. In that case **Rav** says it is mutar, for once she becomes mutar to him she becomes fully mutar to him and **Shmuel** says it is assur, because she becomes a geyores, who is assur for a Kohen to marry.
 - **Others** say that all would agree that the second bi'ah is assur because she is a geyores, who is assur for a Kohen to marry. The machlokes is regarding the first bi'ah. In that case **Rav** says it is mutar because the Kohen has the same yetzer harah as everyone else, and **Shmuel** says it is assur because he cannot fulfil the pasuk of “vahaveisa ehl toch beisecha” (he cannot marry her), and therefore is not included in the parsha of yefas toar.
- A Braisa says, “v'ra'isa bashivya” teaches that the Yid must have seen her and been attracted to her at the time of her capture. “Eishes” teaches that she is mutar even if she was married. “Yefas toar” teaches that the Torah allowed this only out of realization for the strength of the yetzer harah. “V'chashakta” teaches that she is mutar even if she is not beautiful. “Bah” teaches that he may only take one yefas toar, not two. “V'lakachta” teaches that kiddushin with her will be effective even though she may not be a full-fledged geyores. “Lecha l'isha” teaches he cannot take two even if he plans on keeping one for himself and giving the other to someone else. “Vahaveisa” teaches that he may not have bi'ah with her during the war, only later on.