



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

Kiddushin Daf Gimmel

- **Q:** When a Tanna states a number in addition to actually listing the items, there is a reason he gave the number, typically to exclude the possibility of adding anything else to the list. Based on this, what is the number 3 in the beginning of the Mishna coming to exclude (“a woman can be acquired in 3 ways”) and what is the number 2 in the next part of the Mishna coming to exclude (“she can be koneh herself back in 2 ways”)? **A:** The number 3 comes to exclude entering into chuppah, and teaches that doing so is not a valid act of kiddushin.
 - According to **R' Huna** who darshens a kal v'chomer to teach that chuppah can act as a form of kiddushin, the number 3 comes to exclude an act of “chalipin” (where an exchange is made and the purchaser gives the seller something that can be worth even less than a prutah, and when he does so the item to be purchased is then acquired by the purchaser). We would think that since we learn the gezeirah shava of kiddushin to the purchase of the Me'aras Hamachpeila, we should say that just as a field can be purchased with chalipin, kiddushin can be done with chalipin as well. The Mishna therefore teaches that chalipin is not a valid form of kiddushin.
 - **Q:** Based on the gezeirah shava, why is chalipin actually not allowed for kiddushin? **A:** Since it is possible to do chalipin with less than a shava prutah, and since a woman would not give herself away for less than a prutah, the method of chalipin is not allowed.
 - **Q:** What does the number “2” in the Mishna come to exclude? **A:** It comes to exclude chalitza. We would think to darshen a kal v'chomer and to say that if a yevama, who may not be released with a get, may be released with a chalitza, then surely a regular woman, who can be released with a get, can be released with a chalitza. The Mishna teaches that chalitza cannot be used to release a regular woman from marriage.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should learn from the kal v'chomer that it can be used!? **A:** The pasuk says “sefer krisus” – a shtar of get must be used to sever a marriage, and not something else.

B'KESEF

- **Q:** How do we know that money may be used? Also, a Mishna teaches that the father of a naarah or ketanah has a right to the money that is given for her kiddushin. How do we know that money is a form of kiddushin, and how do we know that the father has the rights to that money? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk regarding an “ama ivriya” (a Jewish maidservant) who goes out free when she becomes a naarah says, “v'yatz'ah chinam ein kasef” (she goes out free without money). We darshen, that no money is given to *this* master when she leaves his reshus, but there is money given to another master, i.e. her father, when she leaves his reshus (when she gets married). We see that the kiddushin money goes to him.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk means that money takes her out of her father's reshus, but in fact the money is to belong to her!? **A:** A pasuk clearly teaches that the father may accept kiddushin for his daughter, as the pasuk says “es biti nasati la'ish hazeh”, so how can it be that she would then keep the money!?
 - **Q:** Maybe the father only has a right to keep the money when it is for a daughter who is a ketanah, since she has no ability to accept kiddushin on her own (she is a minor). However, if she is a naarah, who is an adult and can enter into transactions, maybe she can accept kiddushin and keep the money!? **A:** The pasuk says “binureha beis aviha”, which teaches that all profits that come from a girl while she is a naarah go to the father. Therefore, the same would hold true for the kiddushin money.

- **Q: R' Huna in the name of Rav** said that we learn that the earnings of a naarah go to her father from the pasuk of "v'chi yimkor ish es bito l'amah", which teaches that there is a comparison between a daughter and an amah, and a father is therefore entitled to the earnings of his daughter. Based on our last answer, why isn't this learned from "binureha beis aviha"! It must be because "binureha beis aviha" is written regarding the father's ability to be meifer her nedarim. If so, we are left with the question of how do we know that the father gets the kiddushin money!? You can't say that we learn that if he can be meifer her nedarim he should also get to keep the money, because we can't learn out a monetary concept from a an issur concept!? You also can't say that we learn that if the father keeps the penalty paid by someone who rapes his daughter then he should also keep the kiddushin money, because we don't learn concepts of regular monetary payments from penalty payments!? You also can't say that we should learn that since the father also keeps the payments for her embarrassment and the decrease in her value that the rapist must pay (which are not considered to be penalties) then he should also keep the kiddushin money, because the father has a right to those monies based on his right to marry off his daughter to an ugly, disgusting person, which would cause her embarrassment and a decrease in her value, and the value of these rights have now been taken from him by the rapist. However, there is no such entitlement to the naarah's kiddushin money!? **A:** We learn that the father gets the kiddushin money from the pasuk suggested earlier, of "v'yatz'ah chinam ein kasef". We darshen the pasuk to teach that although an amah she leaves her master without giving money to the one whose reshut she is leaving (the master), when she leaves the reshut of another master (i.e. her father) through kiddushin, that master does get money (i.e. the kiddushin money).

 - **Q:** The leaving of the reshut of the master and the father are not comparable, because when she leaves the master, she is completely out of his reshut, whereas when she enters into kiddushin she still needs to enter into chuppah to be completely out of the father's reshut!? **A:** At kiddushin the father totally loses the right to single handily be meifer her nedarim. In that way she is totally out of his reshut, and in that way the leaving of his reshut can be compared (or contrasted) to the leaving from the master.