



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

Kiddushin Daf Mem Vuv

MISHNA

- If a man tells a woman “be mekadesh to me with this date” and after giving it to her he then presents a second date and says “be mekadesh to me with this date”, then if either of the dates are by themselves worth a prutah, she is mekudeshes. If not, she is not mekudeshes.
 - If he tells her “be mekudeshes to me with this date and this date”, then if there is a combined value of a prutah she is mekudeshes, and if there is not, she is not mekudeshes.
 - If as the dates were being given to her she ate them, she would not be mekudeshes unless a single date has the value of a prutah on its own.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who holds that the phrase “be mekadesh to me” is considered to divide the acts of giving the dates so that the value of the dates can't combine? **A: Rabbah** said it is the view of **R' Shimon**, who says regarding a person who admits to having sworn falsely to a number of people, that each swearing is considered separate if he said to them “I swear to you, and I swear to you, etc.”

BEZU UBEZU UBEZU IHM YEISH BIKULAN SHAVA PRUTAH...

- **Q:** What part of the Mishna is the last case said about? If it is on the first case, then why do we need the woman to have eaten the dates? Even if she just left them there it would still not be a good kiddushin!? If it was said on the second case, then how is it that she is mekudeshes? By her eating the date she becomes obligated to pay for it, and it thus becomes a loan, and the halacha is that a woman cannot become mekudeshes with a loan!? **A: R' Yochanan** said the Mishna cannot be explained. **Rav and Shmuel** said this case is being said on the first case of the Mishna and the Mishna should be understood as saying “it goes without saying”, as follows: For sure if she just left the date there it will not be a good kiddushin if it is not worth a prutah, but even more so, even if she ate the dates, in which case we may have said that the eating provides her a greater benefit and value than the actual worth and therefore maybe it is a valid kiddushin. The Mishna therefore teaches that even in that case the kiddushin is not valid unless one of the dates is actually worth a prutah. **R' Ami** said, the case is going on the last case of the Mishna, and when the Mishna says the kiddushin is only valid “when at least one of them is worth a prutah”, it means that the last one has to be worth a pruta (because that is the only one that would not be considered a loan, because the act of kiddushin is final as soon as he hands it to her).
 - **Rava** said, we can learn 3 things from the statement of **R' Ami**. First, that one who gives kiddushin with a loan would not be considered a valid kiddushin. Second, if one gives a loan and a prutah as kiddushin, we say the woman focuses on the prutah and not on the loan, and therefore the kiddushin is valid. Third, if money was given to woman for a kiddushin that was ultimately invalid, the money must be returned to the man.
 - We have learned, if a man gives kiddushin to his sister, **Rav** said, since the kiddushin is obviously not valid, she must return the money to him, and **Shmuel** said, the sister may keep the money as a present.
 - The Gemara explains, **Rav** holds that everyone knows that kiddushin with a sister is ineffective, and he must have given her the money to guard for him. The reason he didn't tell her this outright is because he felt she would not accept the money to guard it for him. **Shmuel** holds that everyone knows that kiddushin with a sister is ineffective, and he must have given her the money as a

gift. The reason he didn't tell her this outright is because he felt she would be embarrassed and would not accept the gift.

- **Q: Ravina** asked, a Mishna says that if one gives flour to a Kohen as challah (the challah obligation only applies to dough, and not to the ingredients), the Kohen must return it to the person and if he doesn't it is considered as stolen by the Kohen. Now, we should say that everyone knows that challah is not given from flour, and therefore, according to **Shmuel** we should say that the flour was given to the Kohen as a gift!? **A:** In that case, if we allow the Kohen to keep the flour, it can lead to a big problem. If the Kohen were allowed to keep it, he would consider it as challah, and therefore if the Kohen were to mix this flour with other flour and combine it to reach an amount that would then be chayuv in challah, the Kohen would think that there is no challah obligation, because part of the flour is (in his mind) challah already. He would then make a dough and eat it without separating challah. It is for this reason that in this case we don't allow the Kohen to keep the flour.
 - **Q:** We have said that everyone knows that challah can't be given from flour!? **A:** People know that this is the case, but the Kohen believes this is based on the fact that we don't want to make the Kohen have to bother to make the flour into dough. The Kohen therefore says that he is mochel on that consideration and is willing to accept the flour as challah and thinks that it will therefore have the status of challah. However, in truth, it will not have the status of challah.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that the Kohen may keep the flour, but that he must remove challah from the flour itself? We find a similar concept where one separated terumah from a flowerpot with a hole for the produce of a flowerpot without a hole, and in that case we say that the Kohen may keep what was given for him, but that he must separate terumah and maaser on what was given to him!? **A:** When dealing with two separate items (the two flowerpots) he will listen when we tell him that he must separate. When dealing with the one portion of flour (in the case of challah) he will not listen. **A2:** Although the Kohen will listen when we tell him that he must separate terumah, the reason we make him return the flour is because if we do not, the person who gave the flour will think that he has satisfied his challah obligation. By making it be returned to him, we are showing him that he has not yet given challah.
 - **Q:** We have said that everyone knows that challah can't be given from flour!? **A:** People know that this is the case, but they believe this to be based on the fact that we don't want to make the Kohen to have to bother to make the flour into dough, and he says that the Kohen is mochel on that consideration and is willing to accept the flour as challah and it will therefore have the status of challah. However, in truth, it will not have the status of challah.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that the Kohen may keep the flour, but that the giver must remove challah again from the dough? We find a similar concept where one separated terumah from a flowerpot without a hole for the produce of a flowerpot with a hole, and in that case we say that the Kohen may keep what was given for him, but that the giver must separate terumah and maaser again!? **A:** When dealing with two separate items (the two flowerpots) he will listen when we tell him that he must separate. When dealing with the one portion of flour (in the case of challah) he will not listen.
 - **Q:** We find in other places that a person will sometimes separate terumah (like when he separates a spoiled cucumber or melon), and we say that the Kohen keeps what was given,

but that the person must separate terumah again!? **A:** In that case we allow that, because D'Oraisa the terumah that was separated was valid, and therefore if terumah is not separated again, it is not the end of the world.