



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

Kiddushin Daf Samach Aleph

- A Mishna regarding hekdesch says, that if one gives a field to hekdesch and wants to redeem it, he gives a certain amount of money for each kor of plantable land. The Mishna says, if the land had in it an area that was 10 tefachim deep, or rocks that were 10 tefachim high, they are not measured along with the rest of the field.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, those areas should at least become hekdesch on their own and should therefore also have to be redeemed!? You can't say that any piece of land smaller than a kor is not redeemed in this way based on this calculation of money, because a Braisa says that it is!? **A: Mar Ukva bar Chama** said, the Mishna is discussing these deep areas that are filled with water and are therefore not fit for planting, and therefore must be redeemed at their regular market value, and not based on the set amount per kor like the rest of the field.
 - **Q:** If so, then even if they are less than 10 tefachim deep they should be redeemed in this way (because they are still not fit for planting)!? **A:** An area less than 10 tefachim deep that is filled with water is viewed as a puddle of the field, and not a separate area. Similarly, a rock less than 10 tefachim tall is considered a bump in the field, and not a separate area.
 - Regarding selling a field, a Mishna says that if a person says "I am selling you a kor of land" and the land had in it an area that was 10 tefachim deep, or rocks that were 10 tefachim high, they are not measured along with the rest of the field. On that Mishna **Mar Ukva** said, even if the deep area is not filled with water, it is not counted along with the land. **R' Pappa** explained, when a person buys land he wants it to be one big piece of land, and not have it look like a few separate pieces of land (which is what these deep areas and high rocks tend to do).
 - **Q:** What would the halacha be in our Mishna, with regard to kiddushin (when the man gives kiddushin with the condition that he has a kor of land)? Do we compare it to hekdesch, and therefore if the deep area is plantable it is viewed as part of the land, or do we compare it to a sale and it is not? **A:** It is more logical to compare it to the case of hekdesch, because he can tell the woman, the fact that the field has these deep areas will not affect you, because I will work the field and bring the produce to you.

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says, we learn from the pasuk by the condition of the people of Gad and Reuven that any condition must be double sided in order to be effective (if A then B, and if not A then not B), since that is how the condition with them was made (if you go and fight in EY you will inherit land on the east of the Yarden, and if you don't go and fight you will not inherit the land). **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** disagrees with the drasha, He says that the double condition was needed there, because if not we would understand the condition that if they don't go and fight they lose even a regular portion of EY itself. Therefore, he holds that any other condition need not be double sided.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Chanina ben Gamliel** seems to have refuted the drasha of **R' Meir**!? **A: R' Meir** says, the words "b'Eretz Knaan" in the pasuk is extra, and teaches the concept of a double sided condition.
 - **R' Chanina** would say that those words are not extra, because they are needed to clarify that their portion would not be in Gilad, but would rather be in EY proper.

- A Braisa says, **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** says we can compare the case of Gad and Reuven to the following mashal. A father says, "one son should inherit Field A, another son should inherit Field B, and a third son should give 200 zuz and then should inherit Field C, and if he does not give the 200 zuz, he should inherit along with his brothers". It is only because of the father's end statement ("if he does not give...") that the son inherits along with the other brothers if he does not give. Similarly, Moshe's doubling of the condition only served to include Gad and Reuven in a share of EY, and was not meant to teach that a condition must be doubled.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, the mashal is very different than the Mishna!? In the Mishna **R' Chanina** said that if the condition of Moshe had not been doubled, Gad and Reuven would not have even gotten a share in EY, and in the Braisa he seems to say that the doubling of the condition only secured them a piece of EY, but that they would never have lost their land in Gilad!? **A:** The Braisa and the Mishna are at different stages of **R' Chanina's** conversation with **R' Meir**, and therefore take on the different understanding at that time.
- **Q:** According to **R' Meir**, we can understand the pasuk that says "ihm teitiv se'eis v'ihm lo seitiv lapesach chatas roveitz". It must give the positive and the negative so that it should be binding. However, according to **R' Chanina**, why do we need both sides to be stated in the pasuk? **A:** Without the second part we would have thought that if someone does a mitzvah he gets reward, and if he doesn't do mitzvos and does aveiros he doesn't get reward but also doesn't get punished. The pasuk therefore teaches that a person gets punished for doing that.
- **Q:** When Avrohom made Eliezer take an oath, he stated the positive and the negative. According to **R' Meir** this makes sense, but according to **R' Chanina**, why did he have to do that? **A:** The second part of the statement was telling Eliezer that if the girl wants to come back but her family does not agree, you should not bring her against their will.
 - **Q:** In the back and forth between Avrohom and Eliezer, Eliezer asked what he was to do if the woman does not want to return to EY with him. Avrohom responded, "if the woman does not want to return to EY with you...". Why did Avrohom have to repeat the question that was asked? **A:** He was telling Eliezer, if the woman's family agrees to send her with you, but the woman herself does not agree, do not take her against her will.
- **Q:** According to **R' Meir** we can understand why the pasuk first says "ihm bechukosai teileichu..." and then says "ihm bechukosai tim'asu...". However, why is the negative stated according to **R' Chanina**? **A:** We would think that if one follows the Torah there is reward, and if he doesn't follow the Torah there is no reward, but there is also no punishment. The Torah therefore must teach that there is punishment for not following the Torah.
- **Q:** According to **R' Meir** we can understand why the pasuk first says "ihm tovu ushmatem..." and then says "v'ihm tima'anu umrisem...". However, why is the negative stated according to **R' Chanina**? **A:** We would think that if one follows the Torah there is reward, and if he doesn't follow the Torah there is no reward, but there is also no punishment. The Torah therefore must teach that there is punishment for not following the Torah.