



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

Kiddushin Daf Lamed Hey

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that we cannot use the fact that women are patur from the obligation to learn Torah to teach that women are patur from all mitzvos that are not time bound, because the pasuk regarding learning Torah and the pasuk that women are patur from pidyon haben are 2 pesukim teaching the same principle, and therefore they cannot teach this principle regarding other mitzvos. The Gemara now asks, that is only according to the view that when we have 2 such pesukim we cannot learn from there to other places. However, according to the view that we can, why don't we learn from there to teach that women are patur from all mitzvos even if they are not time bound mitzvos? **A: Rava** said, **R' Acha bar Yaakov** taught, the pasuk of tefilin says "l'maan tihyeh Toras Hashem b'ficha", and thereby compares all of the Torah to tefilin, and teaches that just as tefilin is a time bound mitzvas assei and women are patur, so too all time bound mitzvos assei women are patur. We can also then learn that if they are patur from time bound mitzvos, they are chayuv in mitzvos that are not time bound.
 - **Q:** This is only a valid answer according to the view that tefilin is a time bound mitzvah. However, according to the view that tefilin is not a time bound mitzvah, this pasuk should teach that women are patur from all mitzvos, even when not time bound!? **A:** It is **R' Meir** who says that tefilin is not a time bound mitzvah, and **R' Meir** also holds that matzah and Hakhel are two pesukim that teach the same principle (that women are chayuv) and therefore can't teach to other places. The result being that in all other time bound mitzvos, women would be patur.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** who says that we can learn from 2 such pesukim to other places, and who also holds that tefilin is not considered to be a time bound mitzvah, where do we learn that women are patur from time bound mitzvos? **A:** The pesukim of matzah, simcha, and Hakhel are 3 pesukim that all teach the same principle, and even he agrees that when we have 3 pesukim like that, we cannot use them to teach in other circumstances.

V'CHOL MITZVOS LO SAASEI...

- **Q:** How do we know this halacha? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** learns it from a pasuk that compares women to men regarding all punishments. **R' Eliezer's** yeshiva taught it is based on a pasuk that compares women to men for all monetary laws in the Torah. **Chizkiya's** yeshiva taught it is based on the pasuk that compares the killing of a woman to the killing of a man for the death penalty.
 - All these pesukim are necessary. If we would only have the first pasuk we would say only regarding punishments women are treated the same, because we want them to be able to get a kapparah. If we would only have the second pasuk we would say it is only regarding monetary matters that women are treated equal, because these laws are needed to carry out daily living activities. If we would only have the 3rd pasuk we would say that only there women are given the same status, because regarding loss of life the Torah is more stringent to have the killer put to death.

CHUTZ MIBAAL TAKIF UBAAL TASHCHIS...

- **Q:** Women are not included in the issur to become tamei, because the pasuk says "emor ehl haKohanim *bnei* Aharon" – the men and not the women. Why are they not included in the issur of baal takif and baal tashchis? **A:** The pasuk says "lo sakifu pe'as roshchem v'lo sashchis es pe'as zikanecha". We darshen that whoever is commanded not to destroy their beard (i.e. men) are commanded in lo sakifu, and those not commanded not to destroy the beard (i.e. women) are not commanded in lo sakifu.
 - **Q:** How do we know that women are not commanded not to destroy the beard? **A:** Either it is based on logic, because they don't have a beard, or it is based on the pasuk.

The pasuk says “roshchem” in the plural, but says “zikanecha” in the singular, and therefore teaches that only one group is included in the issur of the beard – men and not women.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if a woman does have a beard it is considered to be a beard in all respects. Presumably this means that it is included in the issur to destroy the beard!? **A: Abaye** said, it can’t mean to make it assur to destroy it, because we have a gezeira shava on the word “pe’as” from the pasuk discussing Kohanim, and learn that the issur only applies to men based on that parsha beginning with the words “bnei Aharon”.
- **Q:** If the words “Bnei Aharon” are meant to include everything written in that parsha, why do we need the gezeira shava to teach that it doesn’t apply to women? Why don’t we just say that if it doesn’t apply to women who are Kohanim, and Kohanim have many more halachos, then surely it will not apply to regular women, who have less halachos!? **A:** Without the gezeira shava we would think that the words “bnei Aharon” don’t teach to exclude women from the entire parsha, rather only from the immediate subject of the pasuk.
- **Q:** We should say that even now the words “bnei Aharon” only exclude women from the immediate pasuk, and the gezeira shava is used for something else altogether, to teach that what would constitute an assur cutting of the beard – shaving with a razor – for the Kohanim, would be the same for the issur of the cutting the beard for all people!? **A:** The extra word of “pe’as” in the pasuk teaches that the gezeira shava is applied in two ways – to teach that only a razor is assur, and to teach that women are exempt.
- **Q:** If a woman is not included in the issur of destroying a beard, what does the Braisa mean when it says that if a woman does grow a beard it has the status of a beard? **A: Mar Zutra** said, it has the status of a beard for purposes of tzaraas.
 - **Q:** The pasuk clearly says that if a woman has a beard it has the status of a beard for tzaraas!? **A:** The Braisa means that for purposes of the tahara of the tzaraas, the woman’s beard is considered a beard, and she must go through the entire tahara process.
 - **Q:** That is obvious!? If it becomes tamei with tzaraas, she obviously must go through the tahara process!? **A:** When the pasuk speaks of the tzaraas “of a man and a woman on the head or on the beard”, we would think that “on the beard” only refers back to man, and not a woman. The Braisa therefore teaches that the beard of a woman is a beard for purposes of tzaraas.
- **Issi** taught that women are also patur from the issur of “baal yikarchu” (making a bald spot on the head in mourning). This is based on the pasuk that says “banim atem La’Shem Elokeichem lo sisgodidu v’lo sasimu karcha bein eineichem lameis ki ahm kadosh atah La’Shem Elokecha”. The pasuk says “banim”, teaching that the issur of karcha applies only to men and not to women.
 - **Q:** Maybe the limit of “banim” refers back to the issur of “lo sisgodidu” (making cuts in one’s skin in mourning)? **A:** The pasuk says “ki ahm kadosh”, which serves to include women in the issur of lo sisgodidu.
 - **Q:** We have words that exclude women from an issur and words that include women. Why is it that we choose to exclude them from baal yikarchu and choose to include them in lo sisgodidu? **A:** Lo sisgodidu applies anywhere on the body and is therefore more inclusive, whereas baal yikarchu applies only on the head and is therefore less inclusive.
 - **Q:** Maybe women should be excluded from both of these issurim, and “ki ahm kadosh” should teach to include women in the issur of “lo yisritu” (making scratches in the skin by hand)? **A: Isi** holds that srita and gedida are the same issur.