



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

### Kiddushin Daf Nun Gimmel

- A Braisa says, if someone used his portion of a korbon for kiddushin, **R' Yehuda** says it is a valid kiddushin, and **R' Yose** says it is not a valid kiddushin.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, they both get their views based on a drasha of the same pasuk – “zeh yihyeh lecha mikodesh hakodashim min ha'eish”. **R' Yehuda** darshens the word “lecha” to teach that the Kohen's portion of the Korbon shall be his for all purposes, including for kiddushin. **R' Yose** darshens that it is like the portion of the fire. Just as the portion put on the fire is “eaten” by the fire, so too the portion given to the Kohen, is only his for purposes of eating it.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, eventually everyone agreed (even **R' Yehuda**) that using one's portion of a korbon for kiddushin does not create a valid kiddushin. **Rav** said, it remains a matter of machlokes.
    - **Abaye** said, **R' Yochanan's** view seems correct based on a Braisa. The Gemara quotes a long Braisa from the Sifra, which says that a Kohen may not trade or deal his portion of a korbon for a portion of another korbon. Now, an anonymous Braisa of the Sifra is known to be the opinion of **R' Yehuda**. This means that **R' Yehuda** holds in this Braisa that a Kohen does not have ownership in his portion of a Korbon to trade it, and similarly would not have ownership to use if for kiddushin either. From here we see that **R' Yehuda** must have retracted his opinion of the earlier Braisa.
    - **Rava** said, there is a Braisa that suggests like **Rav** as well. The Braisa says, that after the death of Shimon Hatzaddik, the Lechem Hapanim no longer satiated with just a small piece. Therefore, the proper Kohanim would not take a piece (since they were not getting a kezayis and were not being satiated, there was no mitzvah being done by eating it), whereas the gluttonous Kohanim would divide it. This seems to suggest that they would divide it based on giving up their portion in some other korbon for a larger piece of the Lechem Hapanim. We see that there still is a view that the Kohanim do fully own their portion of the korbanos.
      - The Gemara says, this is no proof, because “divide” in the Braisa refers to these Kohanim grabbing a portion that didn't belong to them.

MAASER SHEINI BEIN B'SHOGEH BEIN B'MEIZID LO KIDEISH DIVREI R' MEIR...

- **Q:** Why does **R' Meir** say that maaser sheini can't be used for kiddushin? **A:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** said a tradition, the pasuk says that maaser is “LaShem hu, kodesh LaShem”. He darshens, this means it is for Hashem, and not for use to be mekadesh a woman.
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding terumas maaser says “terumas Hashem”, and yet we have learned in a Mishna that if someone is mekadesh with terumah, the kiddushin is valid!? **A:** Regarding maaser the pasuk says “LaShem”, which is different than simply stating “terumas Hashem” (without the “lamed”).
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding challah (which is considered terumah) says “titnu LaShem”, and a Mishna teaches that terumah can be used for kiddushin!? **A:** The pasuk regarding challah does not say “kodesh”.
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding shmitta says “kodesh” and yet the Mishna says that one may use shmitta produce for kiddushin!? **A:** The pasuk doesn't say “LaShem”.
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding terumah says “kodesh Yisrael LaShem” like terumah, and yet the Mishna says that terumah may be used for kiddushin!? **A:** Although the pasuk compares the Yidden to terumah, this phrase refers to the Yidden being kodesh to Hashem.

- **Q:** The pasuk is comparing the Yidden to terumah, so if the Yidden are “kodesh LaShem”, terumah is as well!? **A: Ravin Saba** explained to **Rav**, the pasuk regarding maaser says “LaShem hu”, which teaches that it is only for Hashem.

UVIHEKDESH B'MEIZID KIDEISH B'SHOGEG LO KIDEISH DIVREI R' MEIR...

- **R' Yaakov** said, I heard two explanations from **R' Yochanan** – one explained the reason why **R' Yehuda** holds that if maaser sheni was used b'shogeg for kiddushin, the kiddushin is not valid, and the other explained why **R' Meir** holds that if hekdesch was used b'shogeg for kiddushin, the kiddushin is not valid. One reason was because the woman does not want the kiddushin to happen in this way, and one reason was because they both don't want the kiddushin to happen in this way, however, I don't know which reason applies for which halacha.
  - **R' Yirmiya** said, we can figure it out. Maaser sheini must be eaten in Yerushalayim, so the woman does not want kiddushin of maaser sheini, because she would have to schlep to Yerushalayim to eat the maaser, but the man doesn't care. Regarding hekdesch, they both don't want kiddushin to happen with hekdesch, because they would be doing an aveirah of using hekdesch for mundane use.
    - **R' Yaakov** didn't agree with this, because he felt the opposite makes sense as well. We can say that regarding maaser, the woman is not happy because she has to schlep, and the man is not happy because it is only worth a prutah in Yerushalayim, and it is quite possible that something will happen to the maaser on the way, making it worth less than a prutah, and making the whole kiddushin invalid. However, regarding hekdesch, although she is not happy to get kiddushin that involves her helping to do an aveirah, but he may not care, because he is gaining something through this (he is getting a wife at no cost to himself).
- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Chisda**, according to **R' Meir**, when hekdesch is used the kiddushin will be invalid, but will the hekdesch become chulin through this use? **A: R' Chisda** said, since the woman does not become mekudeshes, the money remains hekdesch and does not become chullin.
  - **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked **R' Chisda**, what would **R' Meir** say in the case of a sale? Do we assume there too that the parties would not want the transaction to happen with hekdesch money? **A: R' Chisda** said, in the case of a sale, the buyer is not koneh the item being sold.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, there is a machlokes between **R' Meir and R' Yehuda**, if the hekdesch treasurer deposits money with a storekeeper, whether the storekeeper is given the status of a moneychanger (who would be patur if he used the money when it was given to him not in a bundle, and the treasurer would be chayuv for me'ilah) or of a regular person (who would be chayuv for me'ilah for spending the money even when it is given to him not in a bundle). However, it would seem they all agree that if a storekeeper unknowingly used the money, that either he or the treasurer would be chayuv for me'ilah, which means that a sale in which this money was used is a completed sale even according to **R' Meir**? **A: R' Meir** was saying his view according to **R' Yehuda**. He was saying, according to me, the sale is not completed and therefore no me'ilah was done. However, according to you, **R' Yehuda**, at least agree to me that a storekeeper has the status of a regular person! **R' Yehuda** answered that he does not agree, and that a storekeeper has the status of a moneychanger.