



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Kiddushin, Daf ל"ג – Daf כ"ח

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ל"ג---76-----

MISHNA

- If one wants to marry a Kohenes, he must look into (the yichus of) four of her mothers, which is actually 8 mothers: her mother, her maternal grandmother, her mother's paternal grandmother, and her mother, the woman's paternal grandmother, and her mother, her paternal grandfather's mother, and her mother.
- If he wants to marry a Leviya or a Yisraelis he must add one more to the list that he must look into (he must add one level of "mothers" to the 4 main categories listed above).
- If a person determines that one of the woman's ancestors was a Kohen who did the Avodah on the Mizbe'ach then there is no need to investigate further than that Kohen for that yichus line. Same would be true for an ancestor who was a Levi and had sung on the platform along with the Leviim at the Beis Hamikdash. Same is true for an ancestor who was found to be a member of the Sanhedrin. Similarly, anyone whose ancestors are known to have been a public official or a gabbai tzedaka can marry off his daughter to a Kohen and these ancestors need not be looked into. **R' Yose** says, also someone who signed as a witness in the court of the city of Yeshana near Tzipori does not need to have his ancestors looked into. **R' Chanina ben Antignos** says, even someone who was listed in the king's army need not have his ancestors looked into.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that women must be looked into but men do not? **A:** When women fight they accuse each other of znus, and therefore there is no way for us to know whether there is a problem with her yichus. However, when men fight, they accuse each other of being passul for yichus. Therefore, if it is true that they are passul, we would have heard about it already, so we don't have to look into them.
- From the fact that our Mishna seems to say that a woman, even a Kohenes, need not check into her husband, our Mishna is a proof to **Rav**, who says that a Kohenes may marry someone who is not fit for Kehuna.
- **R' Ada bar Ahava** taught a Braisa that said, a man must look into 4 of her mothers, which is actually 12 of her mothers. Another Braisa says it is 4 mothers that is actually 16 mothers.
 - **Q:** **R' Ada bar Ahava's** Braisa can be said to be discussing a woman who is a Leviya or a Yisraelis, and that is why there are 12. However, the other Braisa seems to be arguing on our Mishna? **A:** When our Mishna says that he adds one layer onto the mothers (when marrying a Leviya and Yisraelis) it means one *pair* of mothers, which will bring the total to 16.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna (that says he must check out the woman's yichus) follows **R' Meir**. However, the **Rabanan** hold that every Jewish woman has a chazakah of pure yichus, and there would be no reason to check into them.
 - **Q:** How could we say that **Rav** says the Mishna does not follow the **Rabanan**, when **R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** said that our Mishna is discussing where people claimed that the woman was of passul yichus, and that is why she must be checked out (which would mean the Mishna is even following the **Rabanan**)!? **A:** The one who taught the first statement of **Rav** would not agree with the second statement of **Rav**.

EIN BODKIN MIN HAMIZBE'ACH ULIMAALAH

- The reason is, if the Kohen had not been determined to be of pure yichus, he would not have been allowed to serve on the Mizbe'ach.

V'LO MIN HADUCHAN ULIMAALAH

- A Braisa says that the Levi'im of pure yichus were there (a Levi of impure yichus would not have been allowed to sing with the Levi'im by the Beis Hamikdash).

V'LO MIN HASANHEDRIN ULIMAALAH

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- This is because, as **R' Yosef** taught in a Braisa, the members of a Beis Din must be of pure integrity and of pure yichus. We learn this from a pasuk that compares the members of the Sanhedrin to Moshe Rabbeinu. We learn that just as he was of pure yichus, they too must be of pure yichus.

KOL MI SHEHUCHZIKU AVOSAV MISHOTREI HARABIM

- **Q:** This seems to say that judges not on the Sanhedrin (which is what is meant by the phrase of public officials) must also be of pure yichus. However, a Mishna says that “all are valid to judge monetary cases”, and **R' Yehuda** explains that to mean that even a mamzer is valid!? **A:** **Abaye** said, our Mishna is referring to Yerushalayim, where all judges had to be of pure yichus.

V'GABBAI TZEDAKA MASI'IM

- The reason for this is that a gabbai tzedaka ends up fighting with people (because they can seize assets for tzedaka). Therefore, if they had impure yichus, it would have come out in these fights.
 - The host of **R' Adda bar Ahava** was the son of a ger and he was arguing with **R' Bibi** as to which of them should be running the city. They asked **R' Yosef** who should run the city. At first he answered that since the host was a ger he should not be put in charge. **R' Ada bar Ahava** then told him that this man's mother was a Yisraelis. **R' Yosef** then said, if so, **R' Bibi** should be in charge of the spiritual aspects of the city and the host should run the other matters of the city.
 - The Gemara says that some people would not allow the child of a ger and a Yisraelis to a position of power, and some would allow it.

R' YOSE OMER AHF MI SHEHAYA...

- In that place they would only allow one with pure yichus to sign as a witness.

R' CHANINA BEN ANTIGNOS...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, this is referring to Dovid's army, where only people of pure yichus were allowed to serve. This was done so that they have their own zechus and the zechus of their ancestors to help them win the war.
 - **Q:** We find that Tzelek the Amoni and Urya the Chiti were in the army!? **A:** They were not of those nationalities, rather they were regular Yidden who lived in these places.
 - **Q:** We find that Ittai of Gas was in the army!? We also learned that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that there were 400 children born to “yefas to'ars” that were in the army of Dovid!? **A:** They were there to scare the enemy, but they did not actually get involved in the fighting itself.

-----Daf 77-----

MISHNA

- The daughter of a male chalal is passul to Kehuna forever (regardless of how many generations her father is removed from the relationship that caused the chalal status). If a Yisrael marries a chalala, his daughter is fit for Kehunah. If a chalal marries a Yisraelis, his daughter is passul for Kehuna.
- **R' Yehuda** says, the daughter of a male ger is like the daughter of a male chalal (she is passul for Kehuna). **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, if a Yisrael married a female geoyores, his daughter is fit for Kehuna, and if a male ger marries a Yisraelis, his daughter is also fit for Kehuna. However, if a ger marries a geoyores, his daughter is passul for Kehuna. This applies whether they are regular geirem, or whether they are freed slaves, and applies even if they are 10 generations removed from the actual ancestors that converted. In all these cases the girl will be assur to Kehuna unless one of her parents is a Yid who does not descend from geirem. **R' Yose** says, even if a ger marries a geoyores, their daughter is mutar to Kehuna.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna already said that the status of chalal passes from one generation to the next, so why does the Mishna need to add the word “forever”? **A:** We may think to say that a chalal is like a ger who is a Mitzri or an Adomi, who become mutar at the third generation.

YISRAEL SHENASA CHALALA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we know that the daughter of a chalal is not fit, but the daughter of a chalala is fit? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** says, we learn a gezeira shava on the word “b'amav” from the pasuk regarding the issur for a Kohen to become tamei, which teaches that just as that halacha only applies to males, so too the chalalus only applies to males.
 - **Q:** If so, then even the daughter from the assur relationship itself (i.e. from a Kohen Gadol and a widow) should be mutar to Kehuna? **A:** The pasuk regarding that case says “lo yichalel zaro”, which includes daughters as well.
 - **Q:** The daughter of the Kohen Gadol's son (from the assur relationship) should be mutar, because the gezeirah shava should teach that the female descendants other than his daughter are mutar!? **A:** The pasuk of “lo yichalel zaro” teaches to compare his children to himself (the Kohen Gadol), and just like his own daughter is assur, his son's daughter is therefore assur as well.
 - **Q:** If so, his daughter's daughter should be assur as well!? **A:** The gezeirah shava teaches that the female descendants are mutar. If it doesn't apply to this case, there would be no application.

CHALAL SHENASA BAS YISRAEL BITO PESULAH

- **Q:** The Mishna already taught this earlier when it said that the daughter of a male chalal is passul to Kehuna forever!? **A:** Since the Mishna here gave the case of a Yisrael who married a chalalah, it also mentions the case of a chalal that married a Yisraelis.
- Our Mishna does not follow **R' Dustai ben Yehuda**, who says that just like a Yisrael “purifies” the child of a chalalah (the child from their relationship will be mutar to Kehuna) so too a Yisraelis “purifies” the child of a chalal. He learns this from the pasuk “lo yichalel zaro b'amav” – only when they are from one people (i.e. both parents are chalalim), is when the child is a chalal.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “lo yichalel zaro” teaches that if a woman assur to a Kohen has a child with him, the child will be a chalal. How do we know that the woman herself becomes a chalalah as well? We say, if the child, who did nothing wrong, is a chalal, then kal v'chomer, the woman herself, who did do something wrong, is a chalalah. The Braisa asks, we can refute this by saying that the Kohen himself did something wrong, and yet he does not become a chalal!? We can answer that we cannot compare her to him, because he never becomes a chalal when he has bi'ah with someone who is passul to him (e.g. a maidservant, or a zonah), but she does become a chalalah when she has bi'ah with a passul person (e.g. a chalal, a mamzer). Another way to learn that she becomes a chalalah when she has bi'ah with Kohen is the pasuk of “lo yichalel”, which can be read as “lo yechulal”, which teaches that someone that was valid now becomes a chalalah.
 - **Q:** Why do we need this second reason? **A:** If you want to refute the kal v'chomer by saying that the child becomes passul because the child was created through the act of an aveirah, but the woman, who was not, should not become passul, we can answer that we have another way to learn that the woman will become passul to Kehuna.
- A Braisa says, who is a chalalah? Any girl born from “pessulim”.
 - **Q:** What is meant by “pessulim”? It can't mean that if the woman is assur to the man in any way the child is a chalalah, because if someone remarries his divorcee after she married someone else, which is assur for him to do, we learn from the pasuk that the children are not chalalim!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the Braisa means, a chalalah is a girl born from a relationship with a Kohen that is assur for the Kohen.
 - **Q:** Is it only one born from such a relationship? The woman involved was not born from the relationship, and yet she also becomes a chalalah!? **A: Rabbah** said, the Braisa is saying, who is the chalalah that is mentioned as never having been valid at all in her life? That is the girl born from a relationship between a Kohen and a woman who is assur to him. **R' Yitzchak ben Avin** explains, when the pasuk says a Kohen may not marry a chalalah, it is referring to a woman who was born as a chalalah.
- A Braisa says, if a Kohen Gadol had bi'ah with multiple widows, he is only chayuv to one set of malkus. The same is if even a regular Kohen has bi'ah with multiple divorcees. If the Kohen Gadol has bi'ah with a woman who was a widow, and then became a divorcee, and then became a chalalah, and then became a zonah, in that order, he

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would be chayuv malkus for each one of these characteristics. If she was first a zonah, then a chalalah, then was divorced, and then widowed, he would only be chayuv one set of malkus.

- **Q:** What is the first case of the Braisa? If it means that he had bi'ah with 3 different widows, why would he only get one set of malkus? They are separate entities with separate names!? If the case is that he had bi'ah 3 times with the same widow, then if he was only warned once, it is obvious that he will only get one set of malkus, and if he was warned each time, he would get 3 sets!? **A:** The case is that he had bi'ah with a widow who was widowed from 3 different husbands. We would think that he should get 3 sets of malkus. The Braisa teaches, that since she is one entity, he will only get one set of malkus.
- **Q:** If the Braisa holds that one issur can take effect on another issur, then even if the woman got all these characteristics in the reverse order, he should be chayuv 4 sets of malkus, and if the Braisa holds that it can't take effect, then even when done in the order of the pasuk he should still only get one set of malkus!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa holds that an issur cannot take effect on another issur, but holds that if the second issur is adding something more, then it will take effect. A widow is only assur to a Kohen Gadol. A divorcee becomes assur to a regular Kohen as well. A chalalah becomes assur to eat terumah. **R' Chana bar R' Katina** explains, that a zonah even becomes assur to a Yisrael (to her husband). Therefore, since each issur adds new issurim, they can take effect one on the other.
- **Q:** A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Sheishes**, that we learn from the pasuk that a woman can only become assur to a Kohen Gadol as a widow, divorcee, etc., if she was mutar to him as a besulah. For example, if a Kohen Gadol has bi'ah with his sister who is a widow, he will not be chayuv for bi'ah with a widow, because his sister was not mutar to him as a besulah. **R' Sheishes** asked, the Braisa is only following **R' Shimon**, who says that an issur cannot take effect on another issur. However, the **Rabanan** say that an issur could take effect on another issur!? **A:** The Braisa can even follow the **Rabanan**. They only say that an issur takes effect on another issur when the second issur is a more stringent issur than the first.
 - **Others** had a version that **R' Sheishes** asked, that the pasuk of the Braisa is only needed according to the **Rabanan**, to teach that in this case we don't say the issur will take effect on the other issur, because the second issur is more lenient than the first. However, according to **R' Shimon**, why would a pasuk even be needed to teach that? The Gemara answers, that we would think that an issur of Kehuna is different and even takes effect on another issur. That is why the pasuk is needed.
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if a Yisrael is mezaneh with his sister, he surely makes her a zonah. Does he also make her a chalalah? Do we say a kal v'chomer, that if she can become a chalalah from a relationship assur with a lav, she can certainly become a chalalah from a relationship assur with kares, or maybe the title of chalalah is only given from a relationship that involved an issur of Kehuna? **A: Abaye** said, chalalus is only given from an issur of Kehuna.
 - **Rava** said, we learn this concept in a Braisa, which explains why the issur to marry a divorcee, a chalalah and a zonah had to be mentioned by a regular Kohen and repeated by a Kohen Gadol. The Braisa says that the "chalalah" was repeated to teach that chalalus only comes from a relationship that involves issur of Kehuna.
 - **R' Ashi** said, therefore, if a Kohen has bi'ah with his sister, he makes her into a zonah, and not a chalalah. If he would then have bi'ah with her again, since she is a zonah (which is an issur Kehunah), she would then become a chalalah as well.

-----Daf נ"ח--78-----

- **R' Yehuda** said, if a Kohen Gadol marries and has bi'ah with a widow, he would get 2 sets of malkus: one for "lo yikach" and one for "lo yichalel".
 - **Q:** Why wouldn't he get another set of malkus for the lav of "lo yichalel zaro" (which includes his giving zerah to this bi'ah)? **A:** The case being discussed is where he did not complete the bi'ah, and therefore did not issue any zerah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says, if a Kohen Gadol marries and has bi'ah with a widow who is also a divorcee, he gets malkus for each of the names of issur. This suggests that he will only get 2 sets of malkus!? **A:** The Mishna means that he will get 2 sets of malkus for each of the two names of issur.
 - **Q:** The same Mishna says that if the woman is a divorcee and a chalutza, he would only get one (presumably meaning one set of malkus)!? **A:** The Mishna means that he is only chayuv for her being a divorcee, and not for her being a chalutza (since that is only D'Rabanan), but for her being a divorcee, he will get 2 sets of malkus.
 - **Q:** A Braisa learns the issur of chalutza from a pasuk!? **A:** It is truly only assur D'Rabanan, and the pasuk is only an asmachta.
- **Abaye** said, that when the Kohen gives kiddushin to a woman who is assur to him (with an issur Kehuna), he gets one set of malkus (even if he did not have bi'ah with her), and when he has bi'ah with her he would get a second set of malkus. **Rava** said, he only gets malkus when if he has bi'ah with her (and would then get 2 sets of malkus). This is because the pasuk says “lo yikach...v'lo yichalel”, which teaches that the issur of kiddushin is only if he has bi'ah with her.
 - **Abaye** would agree, that if a man remarried his divorcee after she married someone else, he would not be chayuv unless he has bi'ah with her, because the pasuk says he may not take her “to be to him as a wife”.
 - **Rava** agrees that in the case of the Kohanim, if they have bi'ah with the women assur to them and never gave them kiddushin, they would still get malkus, because the pasuk says “v'lo yichalel”, and he did make her into a chalalah.
 - **Abaye and Rava** would both agree, that if a man only had bi'ah with his divorcee who had married someone else, but did not give her kiddushin, he would not get malkus. The Torah only makes her assur when done in marriage.

R' YEHUDA OMER BAS GER ZACHAR K'BAS CHALAL

- In a Braisa **R' Yehuda** explains his reasoning. He says there is a kal v'chomer. If the daughter of a chalal, who comes from a person of pure yichus (his father was a Yisrael), is passul, then surely the daughter of a ger, who doesn't come from pure yichus, will be passul. The Braisa asks, these cases can't be compared, because a chalal was produced from an aveirah, and maybe that is why his daughter is passul! The Braisa says, the case of a Kohen Gadol with a widow will refute this, because the Kohen Gadol was not produced through an aveirah, and still his daughter is passul. The Braisa asks, maybe in that case his daughter is passul because she was born from an aveirah!? The Braisa says, a chalal's daughter was not created from an aveirah, and yet she is passul. Based on all this, one cannot be learned directly from the other. The common characteristic among them all is that they have an aspect that is uncommon among most people and their daughters are passul to Kehuna. We can say that a ger as well, has an aspect that is uncommon, and therefore his daughter will also be assur to Kehuna. The Braisa asks, maybe the common characteristic among them all is that they have an element of aveirah, whereas a ger does not!?
 - The Braisa continues and says, instead of the original refutation from the case of Kohen Gadol, instead refute the kal v'chomer based on a first generation Mitzri ger, who was not created through an aveirah, and yet his daughter is passul to Kehuna. On that we can ask, maybe he is different, because he may not marry into the kahal!? However, the case of chalal refutes that, because he can marry into the kahal, and yet his daughter is passul. The common characteristic among them all is that they have an aspect that is uncommon among most people and their daughters are passul to Kehuna. We can say that a ger as well, has an aspect that is uncommon, and therefore his daughter will also be assur to Kehuna. The Braisa asks, maybe the common characteristic among them all is that they make a woman passul to a Kohen when they have bi'ah with that woman!? Now, **R' Yehuda** holds that a ger makes a woman passul with his bi'ah as well. Therefore he can learn that the daughter of a ger is passul based on this “tzad hashava”.

R' ELIEZER BEN YAAKOV OMER GER

- A Braisa brings a fourth view and says, **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says that a geyores who converted before she turned 3 years old is mutar to Kehuna, based on the pasuk where Moshe told the army to allow the girls less

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

than 3 years old to live “for yourselves” (meaning so that you can marry them). Pinchas (who was a Kohen) was in the army, and we therefore see that he too was allowed to marry them.

- The **Rabanan** argue and say “for yourselves” does not mean to marry them, it means so that you can take them as slaves.
- The Gemara says, all 4 views are based on the same pasuk of “almanah ugrusha lo yikchu lahem l’nashim ki ihm besulos mizerah beis Yisrael”.
 - **R’ Yehuda** holds that a woman is not mutar to a Kohen unless she comes from full yichus of Yisrael, and therefore the daughter of a ger is passul to Kehuna.
 - **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** holds that the word “mizerah” teaches that as long as some of her yichus is from Yisrael she is mutar to a Kohen.
 - **R’ Yose** darshens the pasuk to teach that as long as she was conceived while her parents were already from Yisrael (they had already converted) she is mutar to Kehuna.
 - **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** darshens that as long as she gets the status of a besula (which happens at 3 years old) when she is a Yisrael, she is mutar to Kehuna.
- **Q: R’ Nachman** asked **Rava**, this pasuk seems difficult to understand, because the first part seems to be discussing a Kohen Gadol, and the later part seems to be discussing a regular Kohen!? **A:** He answered, that is true, but we find other pesukim that must be understood in a similar way, by understanding the pasuk as changing the subject without telling us that it is doing so.

R’ YOSE OMER AHF GER SHENASA GEYORES

- **R’ Hammuna in the name of Ulla** paskens like **R’ Yose**. **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said this as well. However, after the Churban, the Kohanim decided to be more stringent and began to follow the view of **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov**.
 - **R’ Nachman** said, **R’ Huna** told me, if a Kohen comes to ask, we tell him to follow **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov**. However, if he already married the daughter of a ger and a geyores, we do not make him get divorced, based on **R’ Yose**.

MISHNA

- If a person says “this son of mine is a mamzer”, he is not believed. Even if a husband and wife both agree that the baby she is pregnant with is a mamzer, we do not believe them. **R’ Yehuda** says they are believed in both cases.

GEMARA

- The chiddush of the second case is that even though the mother can know with a lot more certainty than the father, still we don’t believe her. Also, even though a child in her stomach does not yet have a chazakah of kashrus, still we do not believe them.

R’ YEHUDA OMER NE’EMANIM

- A Braisa explains, the pasuk regarding a bechor says “yakir”, from which **R’ Yehuda** learns that a father is believed to say which of his sons is a bechor, and just as he is believed regarding bechor, he is also believed to say that his son is from a divorcee or a chalutza. The **Chachomim** disagree and say he is not believed.
 - **Q: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked **Rava**, what do the **Rabanan** do with the word “yakir”? **A:** They use it for a case where the man had children somewhere else, and is therefore needed to identify which of his children are the bechor.
 - **Q:** Regarding what halacha is he believed to say so? It can’t be that he is believed for purposes of giving him a double portion of his estate, because that would be obvious, since he can give it to him as a gift, he is believed to say he deserves it as a bechor!? **A:** The chiddush is that he is even believed for assets that the father gets after the time that he identified him as a bechor, which he therefore did not have the ability to give him at the time of identification, and yet he is still believed.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Meir** a person can be makneh something that he does not yet have, so why do we need the pasuk of “yakir”? **A:** It is needed for assets that he gets as he is dying. Even **R’ Meir** agrees that a person cannot be makneh such assets.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 79-----

MISHNA

- If a man instructed a shaliach to find a husband for, and accept kiddushin for, his daughter, and the father himself then went and accepted kiddushin for his daughter, if the father accepted kiddushin before the shaliach did, the father's kiddushin is effective, and if the shaliach accepted first, then it is the shaliach's kiddushin that is effective. If it is not known whose was first, she must receive a get from each of the men who gave kiddushin (if she wants to marry a different man). If they want, one of them can give a get and the other can then marry her.
- Similarly, if a woman instructed a shaliach to find a husband, and accept kiddushin, on her behalf, and the woman herself then went and accepted kiddushin, if she accepted kiddushin before the shaliach did, her kiddushin is effective, and if the shaliach accepted first, then it is the shaliach's kiddushin that is effective. If it is not known whose was first, she must receive a get from each of the men who gave kiddushin (if she wants to marry a different man). If they want, one of them can give a get and the other can then marry her.

GEMARA

- Both cases of the Mishna are needed. If we would only say the first case, we would think that in that case when the father accepts kiddushin on his own, he means for it to take away the authority of the shaliach, because men know how to search for yichus, and he feels he found a match with good yichus. However, a woman does not feel competent to deal with matters of yichus, and therefore, when she accepts kiddushin on her own she is accepting it conditionally, in case the shaliach doesn't find a match for her. If we would only have the second case, we would think that a woman is more careful to check out who she is marrying, and therefore in that case her acceptance is meant to be mevatel the authority of the shaliach. However, when the father accepts kiddushin, he only does so conditionally, in case the shaliach does not find a suitable match.
- We have learned, if a father accepted kiddushin for his daughter when he was on the road, and the daughter accepted kiddushin on her own behalf in the city later that day, and when we check her we find that she is a bogeres, **Rav** says she is now known to be a bogeres and we therefore assume she was a bogeres the entire day, and her father's kiddushin is therefore invalid, and **Shmuel** says we must be concerned that she was not a bogeres at the time that her father accepted the kiddushin, and therefore we must be concerned for both kiddushin.
 - **Q:** What is the case of this machlokes? If it was within the 6 months after she became a naarah at 12 years old, how could **Rav** assume that she was a bogeres in the morning as well (since most girls do not become a bogeres until 12 and one half years old)? If it was after the 6 months, **Shmuel** would not be concerned for the kiddushin of the father, because he says that a girl becomes a bogeres at 12 years and six months!? **A:** The case is on the last day of the 6 months. **Rav** says, since we see that she is now a bogeres based on simanim, we assume that she was a bogeres all day (since this is the day that she is destined to become a bogeres anyway). **Shmuel** says, since she didn't bring simanim until later in the day, we cannot assume that she was a bogeres earlier in the day.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a mikvah is found to be passul, everything that went to that mikvah from the last time it was checked, is considered to be tamei. We see that we assume that the way it was found is the way it has been. If so, why does **Shmuel** say that she is not assumed to be a bogeres? **A:** The case of mikvah is different, because the tamei item has a chezkas tumah.
 - **Q:** Why don't we instead say that we follow the chazakah of the mikvah, which was at one time measured and found to have the required amount of water!? **A:** Right now we measured it and it is missing water, so we can't follow that chazakah.
 - **Q:** If so, we should say the same thing with the girl – right now she is a bogeres and therefore we should treat her as being so earlier as well!? **A:** We say that she first became a bogeres now, when she was checked.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that regarding the mikvah as well? **A:** The mikvah has 2 problems which tell us to treat the items as tamei – the items have a chezkas

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

tumah, and the mikvah is currently not valid. The father's kiddushin has only one issue – the girl was now found to be a bogeres. Therefore, we must still be concerned for the father's kiddushin.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if one used a barrel of wine for terumah and then finds this barrel to have become vinegar (which can't be used as terumah for wine), for 3 days it is considered as certain, but beyond that it is considered as a safek whether it was wine or vinegar. **R' Chanina** from Surya explained that this follows **R' Shimon**, and the **Rabanan** hold that the barrel is considered to have certainly been vinegar all along (just like the case of mikvah, which is thought to be missing water all along). If so, why does **Shmuel** say that she is not assumed to be a bogeres? **A:** This case is different, because the produce for which the terumah was separated for has a chazakah that it is tevel.
 - **Q:** Why don't we instead say that we follow the chazakah of the barrel, which was at one time checked and found to have been wine!? **A:** Right now we found it to be vinegar, so we can't follow that chazakah.
 - **Q:** If so, we should say the same thing with the girl – right now she is a bogeres and therefore we should treat her as being so earlier as well!? **A:** We say that she first became a bogeres now, when she was checked.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that regarding the barrel as well? **A:** The case of the barrel has 2 problems which tell us to treat the items as tevel – the items have a chezkas tevel, and the barrel is currently vinegar. The father's kiddushin has only one issue – the girl was now found to be a bogeres. Therefore, we must still be concerned for the father's kiddushin.
- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes between **Rav and Shmuel** is a machlokes among Tannaim. A Braisa discusses the case of a person who gave away all his possessions (if a deathly ill person does this and then gets better the gifts become void, but if a healthy man gifted this the gifts are effective) and it was unknown whether he was ill or healthy at the time of the gift, **R' Yaakov** says he keeps his possessions and the recipients must bring proof to show he was healthy at the time, if they want to get the possessions. **R' Nosson** says if he is now healthy, he has to bring proof that he was ill at the time of the gift. If he is now ill, they have to bring proof that he was healthy at the time of the gift. Maybe we can say that **Rav** holds like **R' Nosson** and the **Shmuel** holds like **R' Yaakov**? **A:** **Rav** would say that he could even hold like **R' Yaakov**. He would say that **R' Yaakov** holds like that there only because he says that we keep the money by the person who has the chazakah on the money, but with regard to the girl, since it is the last day of the 6th month, we can't say that there is a chazakah that she is not a bogeres. Also, **Shmuel** would say that he could even hold like **R' Nosson**. He would say that **R' Nosson** holds like that because we say that all people have a chazakah that they are healthy until proven otherwise. However, in the case of the girl, she could very well have been a naarah in the morning and a bogeres in the afternoon.
- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes between **Rav and Shmuel** is a machlokes among Tannaim. Regarding the case of where a father accepted kiddushin for her in the morning on the road and she accepted kiddushin for herself later in the day in the city, and she was then found to be a bogeres, one Braisa says since she is now a bogeres we are not concerned for her father's kiddushin, and another Braisa says we must be concerned for both of the kiddushin. Presumably we can say that one Braisa follows **Rav** and the other follows **Shmuel**? **A:** We can say that both Braisos follow **Shmuel**. The first Braisa is discussing where she says that she already saw that she was a bogeres in the morning, and the second Braisa is discussing where she doesn't say that.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that **Rav and Shmuel** don't argue, and instead **Rav** is referring to a case where she says she saw that she was a bogeres in the morning and **Shmuel** is referring to where doesn't say this? **A:** This can't be, because we find that **Shmuel** was upset at **R' Yosef the son of R' Menashya** of Dvil, who paskened like **Rav**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Mar Zutra** told **R' Ashi** that **Ameimar** paskened like **Shmuel**. However, **R' Ashi** paskened like **Rav**. The Gemara says that we pasken like **Rav**.

MISHNA

- If a man went overseas with his wife and returned some time later with his wife and children and says “this is the wife that I married before I went overseas, and these are her children”, he does not have to bring proof about the wife or the children regarding their yichus (the wife was checked before he married her, and the children will be explained in the Gemara).
 - If he returns with children and says “my wife died overseas and these are her children”, he has to bring proof regarding the yichus of the children, but not regarding the yichus of the wife.
 - If he returns with a different wife and says “I married this woman overseas and these are her children”, he has to bring proof regarding the yichus of the woman, but not for the yichus of the children.
 - If he returns and says “I married a woman overseas, but she died, and these are her children”, he must bring proof about the wife and about the children.

GEMARA

- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, all the cases of the Mishna are discussing a case where the children tag along with the mother (and we can therefore assume that they are her children).
- A Braisa says, if a man comes and says “I married a woman overseas, and this is her and these are her children”, he has to bring proof of the yichus of the woman, but not of the children. He must bring proof for the yichus of the grown children (who don't tag along with the mother) but not of the young children. This is all true when he claims to have only had one wife. However, if he says that he had two wives and one died and he claims that the children that he brings belong to the wife that is still alive, he would have to bring proof of yichus for the woman and for all the children, even for the young ones that tag along with her (because we are concerned that they tag along with her only because she raised them, but that they in fact may be from the wife who has passed away).

-----Daf 80-----

- **Reish Lakish** said, we only rely on the presumption that children that tag along with a woman must be the children of that woman, with regard to them eating kodashim outside of Yerushalayim (i.e. terumah and challah). However, we do not make this assumption with regard to allowing them to marry based on this yichus. **R' Yochanan** said, we make this presumption even with regard to yichus.
 - **R' Yochanan** follows his shitah elsewhere. We find that **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said: we give malkus based on a chazakah, we give misah by skila and sreifah based on a chazakah, but we do not burn terumah based on a chazakah.
 - We give malkus based on a chazakah as taught by **R' Yehuda**, who said that if a woman was established as a niddah by her neighbors (they saw her dressed in the clothing that she wears when she is a niddah), and her husband then had bi'ah with her, we would give him malkus based on that.
 - We give skila and sreifah based on a chazakah as taught by **Rabbah bar R' Huna**, who said that if a man, a woman, a young boy, and a young girl, all live together, and we have no proof that the man and woman are married and that the children are their children, but we presume this (a chazakah) to be the case, we would give skilah based on this chazakah (if the boy would be mezaneh with the woman that we presume to be his mother) and would give sreifah based on this chazakah (if the man would be mezaneh with the girl who we presume to be his daughter).
 - **R' Shimon ben Pazi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, it once happened that a woman came to Yerushalayim carrying a young boy and raised him as her son. When he was older they were mezaneh together. They were brought to Beis Din and killed with skilah. This was not based on knowing with certainty

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that she was his mother, but rather based on the fact that he would tag along with her as a child, which created a chazakah that she was his mother.

- We don't burn terumah based on a chazakah, as seen in a machlokes. **Reish Lakish** says we burn terumah based on a chazakah and **R' Yochanan** says that we do not burn terumah based on a chazakah. They are both following their own shitos based on a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a young child is found next to a dough and there is a piece of dough in his hand, **R' Meir** says the dough is still considered as tahor, and the **Chachomim** say the dough is considered tamei, because it is normal for a young child to touch things (they touch the garbage dumps, where there are often animal carcasses and sheratzim and he therefore has a chazakah that he is tamei, and the fact that he is next to the dough with dough in his hand tells us that he touched the dough and that the dough is therefore tamei). The Gemara there explained that **R' Meir** holds that most children touch the garbage, but a minority of children do not, and since the dough has a chazakah of taharah, we join the minority of taharah with the chezkas taharah, which is able to win out over the majority of children who do touch around in the garbage. The **Rabanan** say that once we have a majority, the minority is considered to no longer exist, and therefore we follow the majority, because when a majority contradicts a chazakah we follow the majority, which therefore tells us that this dough is tamei. Regarding this machlokes **Reish Lakish** said the **Rabanan** would hold that we burn the terumah based on this. **R' Yochanan** says that we would *not* burn the terumah based on this.
 - A Braisa supports the view of **R' Yochanan**. The Braisa puts 2 cases into the same category: the case of the young child next to the dough, and the case of a dough of terumah which was near tamei liquids, and we find that chickens pecked all over the dough (we are afraid that the chickens drank the tamei liquid, and with that still in their mouths, they pecked at the dough, dropping some of the liquid on the dough, making the dough tamei. In these cases, the dough will not be allowed to be eaten (since it may be tamei terumah) but will also not be burned (since it may not be tamei terumah). Since the Braisa puts the two cases in the same category, this suggests that in the case of the small child we would also not burn the terumah, which is exactly what **R' Yochanan** said.
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, we only have the concern that maybe the tamei liquid went into the dough if the liquid was white, but if it was red liquid, we would not have that concern, because if they did peck with the liquid in their mouths, we would see the stain on the dough.
 - **Q:** Maybe the red liquid was absorbed into the dough? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we must say that even if the liquid was red, but it was clear to the point that a child's reflection could be seen in it, then we would be concerned that the dough became tamei and the liquid was absorbed in the dough. However, if the red liquid was cloudy, it could not be absorbed into the dough to the point that it is not noticed, and therefore we would not be concerned that the dough was tamei.

MISHNA

- A man may not be secluded with two women, but a woman may be secluded with two men. **R' Shimon** says, even one man may seclude with 2 women if his wife is there, and he may even sleep in the same room as them, because his wife will guard him from doing any aveirah.
- A man may be secluded with his mother or his daughter, and he may sleep in the same bed with them even if there is bodily contact (as long as the son or the daughter is still young). Once the child is older, they may still sleep next to each other, but they must sleep in clothing.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why is it that a man may not seclude with 2 women, but a woman may seclude with 2 men? **A: Tana Divei Eliyahu** teaches, women are easily convinced, and therefore a woman is not embarrassed to do an aveirah in front of another woman, because she feels that the other woman will quickly follow her.
- **Q:** How do we know that there is an issur to seclude with a woman? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** said, there is a “remez” from the pasuk that warns to be careful from being convinced by a person’s maternal brother to do avodah zarah. From the fact that the pasuk chooses to use the example of a maternal brother (because of the closeness that they share), it must be that a person may seclude with his mother, or else he wouldn’t be hanging around his mother’s house very often, and wouldn’t be especially close with his brothers from his mother more than the brothers from his father.
 - **Q:** What is the simple meaning of the pasuk? **A: Abaye** said, it is teaching, that surely one would not listen to his paternal brother, who he may not like since he sees him as competition in the eventual inheritance. Rather one must even be careful not to listen to his maternal brother who tries to convince him to do avodah zarah.
- **Q:** Maybe we must say that our Mishna does not follow **Abba Shaul**. A Braisa says that if a child dies within his first 30 days, he is carried out to be buried without a coffin or the like (there is no need to honor this child like an older person who died), and can even be buried in the presence of only 3 people – a woman and two men. However, it should not be done with 2 women and one man (because the cemeteries were far from the city, and would therefore result in the man being secluded with 2 women). **Abba Shaul** says the burial can even be done with one man and two women. We see that **Abba Shaul** says that there is no problem of seclusion! **A:** It may be that **Abba Shaul** would agree that it is assur. It is only in the case of a burial where it is mutar, because the yetzer harah could not make someone do an aveirah like that in a period of mourning. The **Rabanan** (the **T”K**) holds like **R' Yitzchak**, who darshens a pasuk to teach that even during mourning a person’s yetzer harah is strong. **Abba Shaul** says that pasuk is referring to the yetzer harah causing a person to question why Hashem is treating him so. The **Rabanan** would agree with that, but would still say that it is assur to allow one man with 2 women for a burial, because a story once took place where a man and a woman once faked a burial just so that they should be able to seclude themselves and do an aveirah.

-----Daf נד---81-----

AVAL ISHA ACHAS

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna only allows one woman to be secluded with 2 men when the men are of good character. However, if the men are immoral men, a woman may not even seclude with 10 men.
 - There was once a story where ten men carried out a woman as if she were dead, just so that they could be secluded with her to do an aveirah.
 - **R' Yosef** said, we find that 10 people get together to steal a beam that requires 10 people to carry it. We see that immoral people are not embarrassed to do aveiros together.
 - **Q:** Maybe a Mishna can be a proof to this statement of **Rav** as well. The Mishna says that when a husband warned his wife not seclude with a certain person and she didn’t listen and did seclude with that person he must take her to Yerushalayim to go through the sotah process. The Mishna says that he needs two *talmidei chachomim* to escort him to make sure that he does not have bi’ah with his wife on the way. This seems to support **Rav’s** statement that 2 men are sufficient for purposes of yichud only if they are decent men, but if they are immoral men, even 10 men with a woman would be a problem for purposes of yichud? **A:** The Mishna does not support this statement. It may be that the only reason that talmidei chachomim must be sent in the case of the Mishna is because we need to send people who know how to warn him to prevent him from having bi’ah with his wife.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna only allows a woman to be secluded with 2 men in the city, but outside of a city a woman may only be alone with 3 men, because if there are only 2 men and one of them have to go to the bathroom, that will mean that there is one man left with the woman.
 - **Q:** The Mishna quoted above says that 2 people accompany them, which makes for a total of 3 men and the one woman. This seems to support **Rav**, who says that 2 men are trusted with a woman (with regard

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

to halachos of yichud) only in the city, but outside of a city a woman may only be alone with 3 men? **A:** This Mishna is no support of **Rav**. It may be that 2 men are generally enough. However, in this case we need 2 men besides the husband so that there can be 2 witnesses against the husband if he has bi'ah with his wife (and are not there for purposes of yichud).

- **Rav and R' Yehuda** were walking on the road and there was a woman in front of them. **Rav** said, let's hurry away from her so that we will not transgress the issur of yichud. **R' Yehuda** asked, you have said that it is mutar with two men if they are moral men, and we are moral men!? **Rav** said, I was referring to men of extraordinary morals, like that of **R' Chanina bar Pappi** and his colleagues.
- **Rav** said, we give malkus for the violation of yichud, but we do not make a woman assur to her husband based on yichud. **R' Ashi** said, we only give malkus for yichud with a single girl, but not for yichud with a married woman, because that would cause rumors to spread that her children are mamzeirem. **Mar Zutra** would give malkus for yichud with a married woman as well, but would announce that the malkus is only for violation of yichud, so that rumors not spread about her children. **R' Nachman of Parhatya** asked **R' Ashi**, why don't you also give malkus and make this announcement? He said, I am concerned that not everyone who hears about the malkus will also hear the announcement.
 - **Rav** darshened a pasuk to teach that we even give malkus based on rampant rumors of bad doing by a person. **Mar Zutra** would give such malkus.
 - **Rabbah** said, if a woman's husband is in the city, we do not give her malkus for yichud, because we can assume that she was not mezaneh, out of fear for her husband.
 - **R' Yosef** said, we do not give malkus for yichud when the door of the room was open to the reshus harabim.
 - **R' Yosef** once had a ladder removed between the floors of his house so that his wife and **R' Bibi** (who was in **R' Yosef's** house at the time) be separated and not subject to yichud.
 - **Q:** We just said that if the woman's husband is in the city there is no problem of yichud?
A: **R' Bibi** and **R' Yosef's** wife were friendly, and therefore there is a concern even with her husband in the city.
 - **R' Kahana** said, if men are in an outer room and women are in an inner room (and can only exit via the outer room), there is no problem of yichud (the men have no reason to go into the inner room, and a woman coming into the outer is not a problem, because there is more than one man there). However, if the men are in the inner room and the women are in the outer room, there is a problem of yichud. A Braisa teaches the reverse. **Abaye** said, therefore we must be stringent and prohibit both of these cases.
 - **Abaye and Rava** would put separations between the men and the women at the shiur so that if one tried to go to the other it would make noise.
 - **R' Amram Chasida** once had women redeemed from captivity and put them in the upper level of his house. He removed the ladder to go to that level so that there should not be any problems of yichud. When he caught a glimpse of one of the women, his yetzer harah became very strong, and he carried a ladder that would normally need 10 people to be carried, and proceeded to climb the ladder to the second floor. Halfway up the ladder he yelled out that there was a fire in his house (knowing that people would come and he would therefore be prevented from doing the aveirah). The **Rabanan** came running and saw what was taking place. The complained that he embarrassed them by letting them see him like that. He said, it is better than having done the aveirah and then being embarrassed in Olam Habbah. He then forced the yetzer harah to leave him, and a pillar of fire was seen leaving him.
 - **R' Meir** would make fun of people who did aveiros, because he felt that they can win the yetzer harah if they wanted to. One day, the yetzer harah appeared as a woman on the opposite side of the river from **R' Meir**. **R' Meir's** desire was so strong for her that he began crossing the river on a narrow plank of wood. When he was halfway across the yetzer harah released him from his control and told him, "If not for the fact that in Heaven they told me to stay away from **R' Meir**, I would have made your life worthless".
 - **R' Akiva** would make fun of people who did aveiros, because he felt that they can win the yetzer harah if they wanted to. One day, the yetzer harah appeared as a woman on top of a date tree. **R' Akiva's** desire

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

was so strong for her that he began climbing the tree. When he was halfway up the yetzer harah released him from his control and told him, “If not for the fact that in Heaven they told me to stay away from **R’ Akiva**, I would have made your life worthless”.

- **Plimo** would curse the yetzer harah. On Erev Yom Kippur the yetzer harah dressed as a poor person, talked his way into **Plimo’s** house, and got himself a seat at the table. **Plimo** told him to stop doing disgusting things (he had spit into his cup). The yetzer harah made himself appear as if he died. They then heard people saying that **Plimo** had killed this man. **Plimo** ran to the outhouse to hide. The “poor man” appeared there as well. When he saw how distraught **Plimo** was, he revealed that he was the yetzer harah and had done this because **Plimo** cursed him all the time. He explained that the proper reaction should be to daven to Hashem to save him from the yetzer harah, but not to curse the yetzer harah.
- **R’ Chiya bar Ashi** would daven during tachanun for Hashem to save him from the yetzer harah. His wife couldn’t believe that he even had a desire for zenus anymore and decided to test him. She dressed up as a zonah and passed by him to interest him. He went and had bi’ah with her. When he came home he went into the oven to kill himself. His wife told him, “It was me, so you did no aveirah”. He said, “I still intended to do the aveirah”. For the rest of his life he fasted as a kaparah, and eventually died from his intensive fasting.
 - We find this concept in a Braisa, that the thought of doing an aveirah is enough to require a kaparah. The Braisa says, the pasuk says “ishah hafeiram vaHashem yislach lah”. This refers to a woman who is unaware that her husband has been meifer her neder, and she nevertheless transgresses the neder. The pasuk teaches that this woman needs a kaparah. When **R’ Akiva** would reach this pasuk he would cry and say, if someone who intended to do an aveirah but did not do it, needs a kaparah, how much more so someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does do it! Similarly, the pasuk says that if someone is unsure that he did an aveirah he must bring an asham taluy as a kaparah for his aveirah. If someone who did not intend to do an aveirah, but ultimately did one, as in the case where he thought he was eating kosher fats but may have eaten cheilev (there was one piece there and he thought it was kosher), needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does it! **Issi ben Yehuda** said, this pasuk is teaching that if someone who is unsure if he did an aveirah, such as in a case where there are two pieces of fats – one kosher and one non-kosher – and he ate one thinking it was kosher, must bring a korban because he needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do an aveirah and actually does it!

MISYACHEID ADAM IHM IMO

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of R’ Assi** said, a person may be secluded with his sister (although he may not live in the same house with her), and he may live in the same house with his mother and his daughter. When he said this to **Shmuel**, **Shmuel** said, it is assur for a person to be secluded with any of the arayos, even with an animal.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that a person may be secluded with his mother and his daughter!? **A:** **Shmuel** will say, a Braisa says that it is assur to be secluded with one’s sister, which you said is mutar. Rather, we must say that it is a machlokes among Tanna’im. The same would be for a mother and a daughter. In fact, we find that **R’ Meir** would be careful not to be secluded with his daughter.
 - **Abaye** would make sure that no animals were in the field when he would learn there, so that he should not be secluded with the animals. **R’ Sheishes** would make sure they were across the bridge. When **R’ Chanan of Neharda’ah** asked **R’ Kahana** why he allowed an animal to be near him as he learned in the field, **R’ Kahana** told him “I did not realize the animal was there”.
- **Rava** said, a person may be secluded with 2 women who are sisters in law (they are married to brothers), with 2 co-wives, with a woman and her mother in law, with a woman and her stepdaughter, and with a woman and a young girl who understands what bi’ah is, but would never have bi’ah herself at that point in her life.

HIGDILU ZEH YASHEIN B’KSUSO...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** At what age must they make sure to be clothed if they are sleeping in the same bed? **A: R' Adda bar R' Azza in the name of R' Assi** said, a girl at the age of 9 years and a day, and a boy at the age of 12 years and a day. **Others** say a girl at the age of 12 years and a day, and a boy at the age of 13 years and a day. Both views are meant to require it when the girl reaches an age of physical maturity.
- **Rafraim bar Pappa in the name of R' Chisda** said, it is only mutar to for the father and young daughter to sleep in the same bed without clothing if she is not embarrassed to be naked in front of him. If she is, it shows that she has some desire for bi'ah, and therefore it would be assur.
- **R' Acha bar Abba**, who was **R' Chisda's** father-in-law, went to visit at **R' Chisda's** house. When there, he took his young granddaughter into his bed with him, without clothing. **R' Chisda** told him, she is an arusa, and therefore you should not have done that! **R' Acha** replied, if she is an arusa, you have violated the statement of **Rav**, who said that a person should not accept kiddushin for his daughter when she is a minor, until she grows up and is able to say who she wants to marry! **R' Chisda** said, you have also violated a statement of **Shmuel**, who said that a person should have no dealing with a woman! **R' Acha** said, **Shmuel** has said that it is mutar if it is done for the sake of a mitzvah, and I did this to make my daughter happy when she sees how much I love her daughter. Therefore, I did not violate the statement of **Shmuel**.

-----Daf כב---82-----

MISHNA

- A bachelor should not be the teacher of small children. A woman should not be the teacher of small children. **R' Elazar** said, also someone who has no wife should not be a teacher of small children.
- **R' Yehuda** says, a bachelor should not be a shepherd of cattle, and two bachelors should not sleep with one blanket. The **Chachomim** allow these two things.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why can't the bachelor teach small children? It can't be because we suspect that he will be mezaneh with the child, because in a Braisa the **Chachomim** told **R' Yehuda** that Yidden are not suspected of bestiality or homosexuality!? **A:** Rather, a bachelor can't teach a child, because we are concerned that he will have too much contact with, and will be mezaneh with the mothers of the children, and a woman should not be the teacher of young children, because we are concerned that she will have too much contact with, and possibly be mezaneh with, the fathers of the children.

R' ELAZAR OMER AHF MI SHE'EIN...

- **Q:** Does he mean a person that is not married, or even one that is married but is not currently living with his wife? **A:** A Braisa says that even someone who is married, but is not living with her, should not be the teacher of small children.

R' YEHUDA OMER LO YIREH...

- A Braisa says, the **Chachomim** told **R' Yehuda** that Yidden are not suspected of bestiality or homosexuality.

MISHNA

- Anyone whose business involves items needed by women may not seclude even with many women. A person should not teach his son a trade that provides for the needs of women.
 - **R' Meir** says, a person should always teach his son a clean and easy trade, and he should daven to Hashem, to Whom all wealth and possessions belong. For there is no trade that does not have poor people and wealthy people. This is because poverty and wealth don't come from a trade, rather they come based on the zechusim of a person.
 - **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, have you ever seen an animal or bird that has a trade? And yet they sustain themselves without any tzaar. Now, these animals were created to serve me, and I was created to serve Hashem. Surely, I too am supposed to be sustained without any tzaar. The reason I have tzaar doing so is because my bad actions have caused me to lose the easy sustenance.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abba Guryon of Tzadyan in the name of Abba Gurya** said, a man should not teach his son to be a donkey driver, a camel driver, a wagon driver, a sailor, a shepherd, or a storekeeper, because these trades are the trades of robbers. **R' Yehuda** said in his name, most donkey drivers are resha'im, most camel drivers are righteous, most sailors are chassidim, the best of doctors are destined for Gehenom, and the righteous of the shoctim are partners with Amalek.
- **R' Nihorai** said, I will leave every trade in the world and only teach my son Torah, for a person benefits from the reward of Torah in this world, and the principle remains for him in Olam Habbah. All other trades are not like this. When a person is sick, or old, or in suffering, and cannot work, he will die of starvation. Torah is not like that, rather it guards him from all evil in his youth and gives him a future and hope in his old age. We see this in psukim.
 - We also see from psukim that Avrohom Avinu fulfilled the entire Torah even before it was given to us.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, anyone whose business is with women, has bad characteristics (and one should stay away from him). For example, goldsmiths who make jewelry, processors of garments, the ones who clean hand mills, peddlers of women's items, weavers, barbers (who women bring their children to), launderers, blood letters, bathhouse attendants, and tanners. From these people we do not appoint a king or a Kohen Gadol.
 - The reason is not because they are passul, but rather because their professions are considered to be demeaning.
 - A Braisa says there are 10 things that are said about a blood letter: he walks on his side (he is haughty), he is conceited, he leans when he sits (again, a sign of haughtiness), he is stingy, he has an evil eye, he eats a lot and goes to the bathroom very little, he is suspected of zenus, and of robbery, and of murder.
- **Bar Kapparah** darshened, a person should always teach his son a clean and easy trade.
 - **Q:** What is an example of such a trade? **A: R' Yehuda** said, a certain type of embroidery.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, there is no trade that ceases to exist. Lucky is the one who sees his parents in a superior type of trade, and woe is to the person who sees his parents in an inferior trade. The world can't exist without perfume merchants and without tanners. Lucky is the one who deals with perfume and woe is to the one who must deal with tanning hides. The world cannot exist without males and females. Lucky is the one whose children are boys, and woe is to the one whose children are girls. **R' Meir** said, a person should always teach his son a clean and easy trade, and he should daven to Hashem, to Whom all wealth and possessions belong. For there is no trade that does not have poor people and wealthy people. This is because poverty and wealth don't come from a trade, rather they come from Hashem, to Whom all wealth belongs.

R' SHIMON BEN ELAZAR OMER IHM RA'ISA MIYAMECHA

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, in all my days I have never seen a deer that made dried figs, or a lion that was a porter, or a fox that was a storekeeper. And yet they sustain themselves without any tzaar. Now, these animals were created to serve me, and I was created to serve Hashem. Surely, I too am supposed to be sustained without any tzaar. The reason I have tzaar doing so is because my bad actions have caused me to lose the easy sustenance.

R' NEHORAI OMER MANI'ACH ANI KOL UMNUS...

- A Braisa says, **R' Nihorai** said, I will leave every trade in the world and only teach my son Torah, for all other trades only benefit a person in his youth (when he is able to work) and in old age it leaves him to hunger, whereas Torah benefits a person in his youth and gives him a future and hope in his old age as well.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK ASARAH YUCHSIN!!!

HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA KIDDUSHIN!!!

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HADRAN ALACH SEDER NASHIM!!!

MAZEL TOV!!!