



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

Kiddushin Daf Daled

- **Q:** The Gemara said that we learn that a father gets the kiddushin money for his daughter who is a naara, based on the pasuk of "v'yatz'ah chinam ein kasef". However, a Braisa says that the pasuk is needed for another drasha. The Braisa says that "v'yatz'ah chinam" teaches that when a girl becomes a bogeres (at 12 ½ years old) she goes out free, and "ein kasef" teaches that she goes out free when she becomes a naarah (at 12 years old). If so, how is the pasuk available for our drasha? **A: Ravina** said, the pasuk writes the word "ein" with a "yud". This extra yud allows us to make the additional drasha to teach that a father gets the kiddushin money of his daughter who is a naarah.
 - **Q:** Where do we see that we darshen an extra "yud" for a drasha? **A:** A Braisa regarding the daughter of a Kohen who was widowed without children says "v'zerah ein lah", and teaches that she may then go back to her father's house and eat terumah. The word "ein" is written with a yud and the Braisa darshens the extra yud to teach that she must also not have any grandchildren. Also, the extra yud teaches that even if she has passul children she would not be allowed to go back and eat terumah.
 - **Q:** How could the yud be used to teach regarding passul children when it is used to teach regarding grandchildren? **A:** We don't need the yud to teach regarding grandchildren, because we have the principle that "grandchildren are like children". Therefore, the pasuk is only needed to teach regarding passul children.
 - **Q:** How does the Braisa know that we can darshen a yud in this way? **A:** We find that the word "ein" is sometimes written without a yud, as in the pasuk of "mei'ein Bilam" and "mei'ein yevami". Therefore, when it is written with a yud it must be written so, to teach a drasha.
 - We have now said that a father is entitled to his naarah daughter's earnings based on the pasuk of "biti l'amah" and to her kiddushin money based on the pasuk of "ein kasef". Both pesukim are needed. If we would only have been taught that her kiddushin money goes to her father we would say that is because she didn't work for this money. However, her earnings for which she worked, maybe don't go to her father. If we would only have a pasuk to teach regarding earnings, we would say that since the father supports her he is entitled to her earnings, but kiddushin money, which comes from elsewhere, he is not entitled to. Therefore, both pesukim are needed.
- **Q:** We have stated above that "v'yatz'ah chinam" teaches that when a girl becomes a bogeres (at 12 ½ years old) she goes out free, and "ein kasef" teaches that she goes out free when she becomes a naarah (at 12 years old). Why didn't the Torah just tell us that she goes out as a naarah and we would then know that she certainly goes out as a bogeres!? **A: Rabbah** said, if we only had one teaching we would say that it refers to a bogeres (which is the smaller novelty). We need a second teaching so that we are now forced to say that one teaches that even a naarah goes out free.
 - We find this concept regarding the halacha that a Jewish slave owned by a Kohen may not eat terumah. A Braisa says that the pasuk teaches that a Jewish slave owned by a Kohen who is to go out free at 6 years may not eat terumah, and the pasuk also teaches that a slave who will be remaining until Yovel may also not eat terumah. The Braisa asks that the pasuk should only teach regarding the slave who is to be there until Yovel and we will then know that the slave who is only there for 6 years may surely not eat terumah as well? The Braisa answers that if we would only have one teaching we would assume that it is teaching regarding the 6 year slave (which is a smaller chiddush).

Therefore, we need two teachings so that we know to apply this teaching to a Yovel slave as well.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, in the case of the Kohen's slaves, they are two separate people and therefore even if the pasuk would have been specific about each type of slave we would still not have an issue as to why the pasuk teaches regarding each type of slave, because we would say that the Torah wrote something that can otherwise be learned by a kal v'chomer (as the Torah sometimes does). However, regarding the amah, if she goes out when becoming a naarah, there is no case of her going out when she becomes a bogeres (since she would have already gone out when reaching naarus)!? **A: Abaye** said, the case would be where she was never a naarah, but became a bogeres as an ailunis (as such, she never had simanim, which are required to show that one is a naarah). We would think that a girl who doesn't become a naarah never goes out free. The pasuk therefore teaches that a bogeres goes out free.
 - **Q: Mar bar R' Ashi** asked, a bogeres should go out free based on a kal v'chomer – if bringing simanim takes a girl out of the reshus of her master even though it would not take her out of the reshus of her father, then reaching bagrus, which takes a girl out of the reshus of her father, should certainly take her out of the reshus of her master!? **A:** He therefore said, the pasuk is needed only to teach that the sale of a girl who turns out to be an ailunis is considered to be a good sale. We would think that only a girl who eventually brings simanim is allowed to be sold in the first place. The pasuk therefore teaches that even a girl who is an ailunis may be sold.
 - **Q:** Why is **Mar bar R' Ashi** so bothered with the fact that the Torah wrote something that can be learned from a kal v'chomer? We have learned that at times the Torah writes something that can be learned from a kal v'chomer!? **A:** We only say that when there is no other possible drasha to make.
- We have learned earlier that **R' Yehuda** learns that kiddushin may be done with money based on the pasuk of "v'yatz'ah chinam ein kasef". A Braisa gives a different source. The Braisa says, the pasuk says "ki yikach ish isha", and the word "taking" refers to money, as another pasuk says "nasati kesef hasadeh kach mimeni". The Braisa asks, we should learn this from a kal v'chomer!? If an amah ivriyah, who cannot be acquired with bi'ah, can be acquired with money, then a woman, who can be acquired with bi'ah, can surely be acquired with money! The Braisa says that a yevama refutes this, because a yevama can be acquired with bi'ah, and cannot be acquired with money. The Braisa asks, a yevama cannot be acquired with a shtar, and maybe that is why money won't work there, but a woman, who can be acquired with a shtar should also be able to be acquired with money! The Braisa says, that is why the pasuk says "ki yikach ish", which teaches that kiddushin may be done with money.
 - **Q:** Why does the Braisa end off by saying that a pasuk is needed, when it just said that the kal v'chomer stands, and a pasuk is therefore not needed!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted. It is based on an amah ivriya. We can say that an amah ivriya can be acquired with money only because she can also be freed with money. That is why the pasuk is needed.
 - The Gemara says that both pesukim ("v'yatz'ah chinam" and "ki yikach ish") are needed. If we would only have "ki yikach", we would say that the kiddushin money is always hers. The pasuk of "v'yatz'ah chinam" teaches that if she is a naarah the money belongs to her father. If we would only have the pasuk of "v'yatz'ah chinam", we would think that money has to be given to create a kiddushin, but the money may even be from the woman to the man. The pasuk of "ki yikach" therefore teaches that the money must go from the man to the woman.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "u'bi'ala", which teaches that bi'ah may be used for kiddushin. The Braisa asks, this should be learned from a kal v'chomer – if a yevama, who cannot be acquired with money, can be acquired with bi'ah, then surely a woman who can be acquired with money, can be acquired with bi'ah!? An amah ivriya refutes this, because she can be acquired with money and cannot be acquired with bi'ah. The Braisa asks, maybe the reason that an amah ivriya can't be acquired with bi'ah is because she is not being bought for marriage, but a regular

woman who is, could be acquired with bi'ah!? The Braisa says, that is why the pasuk says "u'bi'ala", which teaches that bi'ah may be used to acquire a woman.

- **Q:** Why does the Braisa end off by saying that a pasuk is needed, when it just said that the kal v'chomer stands, and a pasuk is therefore not needed!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted. It is based on a yevama. Maybe a yevama can be acquired with bi'ah only because she is already connected with a "zikah" to the yavam. However, a regular woman who has no halachic connection to the husband before the kiddushin, maybe cannot be acquired with bi'ah!? Therefore, the Braisa says that the pasuk of "u'bi'ala" teaches that bi'ah may be used to acquire a woman.