

12 Adar II 5776
March 22, 2016



Kiddushin Daf 11

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Why a Dinar?

The *Mishna* had stated: The monetary transaction, according to Beis Shamai, must be done with a *dinar* or the equivalent of a *dinar*.

The *Gemora* asks: What is Beis Shamai’s reasoning?

Rabbi Zeira answers: A woman is particular that she should not become betrothed for less than a *dinar*.

Abaye asks: If so, what about the daughters of Rabbi Yannai, who are generally particular not to accept *kiddushin* of less than three *kav* of gold *dinars*? Are you saying that if she would accept only a *dinar* from someone that it would not be a valid *kiddushin*?

Rabbi Zeira responds: If she would knowingly take this amount of *kiddushin*, indeed it would be valid. The case I am referring to is if she took the money at night (*and was unable to see the value of the coin*). Alternatively, the case is where she made a messenger to accept *kiddushin* for her, and did not specify how much she wants.

Rav Yosef says: The reasoning of Beis Shamai is as stated by Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav Assi that any “money” stated in the Torah refers to Tyrian currency (*pure silver*), while Rabbinic money refers to provincial currency (*seven parts copper and one part silver*). (11a)

Tyrian and Provincial Currency

The *Gemora* now discusses a previous statement. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav Assi: Any “money” stated

in the Torah refers to Tyrian currency (*pure silver*), while Rabbinic money refers to provincial currency (*seven parts copper and one part silver*).

The *Gemora* asks: Is this a rule? The case of partial admittance, where the Torah states that an oath must be taken, seems to be unlike this rule. The verse states: “*When a person will give to his friend money or vessels to watch.*” And the *Mishna* states: In order for the judges to administer an oath, the amount of the claim (*either the amount claimed or the amount denied*) must be at least two *ma’ah* of silver (*a ma’ah is the Tyrian coin worth the least*), and the amount admitted must be at least one *perutah*! [Being that the Torah states “money” and Chazal state it means two silver *ma’ah*, it is clear that “money” is not a set amount.]

The *Gemora* answers: In this case we compare money to vessels. Just as there must be vessels, meaning at least two, so too, there must be two silver coins involved.

And similarly, just as money is an item of importance, so too, the vessels must be something of importance (*valued as at least two ma’ah*).

The *Gemora* asks: What about *ma’aser sheini*? The verse there states: “*And you will bind up the coins in your hand.*” And the *Mishna* states: If someone exchanges his *perutos* (*copper coins used to redeem ma’aser sheni with*) for a *sela* (*large silver coin*) etc. [This implies that *perutos* of copper may also be used to redeem *ma’aser sheini* so that the holiness of the *ma’aser sheini* goes off the fruit and

onto the coin, even though the Torah uses the term “money.”]?

The *Gemora* answers: There we have an extra letter of “*ha’kesef*” to teach that even copper coins may be used to redeem *ma’aser sheini*.

The *Gemora* asks: What about redemption of consecrated property? The verse states: “*And he will give the money and it will be established to him.*” And Shmuel states: If someone redeems consecrated property worth a *maneh* using a coin worth only a *perutah*, it is valid!

The *Gemora* answers: We derive from *ma’aser*, being that by both, the word “*kesef*” is used, that a *perutah* may be used for redeeming *hekdesch* as well.

The *Gemora* asks: What about the *kiddushin* of a woman? The verse states: “*When a man will take a woman and cohabit with her.*” And we derive a *gezeirah shavah* from the sale of the field of Efron, using the similar terminology of “*kichah*,” that this is referring to a monetary transaction (*and therefore it is as if “kesef” is written by kiddushin*). How can Beis Hillel say in our *Mishna* that even a *perutah* is valid? Can it be that Rav Assi’s statement is only in accordance with Beis Shamai?

Rather, Rav Assi must be stating the following: Any set amount of money stated in the Torah is in Tyrian currency, and a set amount of Rabbinic money refers to provincial currency.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the novelty of this teaching? We have learned in a *Mishna*: The five *sela’im* for the redemption of the firstborn, the thirty *sela’im* fine for the owner of an ox who gored and killed a Canaanite slave, the fifty *sela’im* fine paid by a seducer or rapist of an unmarried *na’arah* and the one hundred *sela’im* fine for a new husband who claims falsely that his wife had been unfaithful (*after the kiddushin and she was therefore not*

a virgin by the time of nisuin) are all calculated in the “*Temple shekel*,” in the Tyrian *maneh*. [*A Temple shekel is the equivalent of four dinars. The Mishna is teaching us that when the Torah states “kesef,” we evaluate it using the Tyrian currency; this is the same as Rav Assi!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Assi is teaching us regarding the Rabbinic money, as this is not stated in the *Mishna*.

For we learned in a *Mishna*: Someone who shouts into or hits his friend’s ear must pay a *sela* (*for the humiliation*). The *braisa* did not specify what type of *sela* it is referring to. Rav Assi teaches us that one should not say that this refers to one that is worth four *zuz*, but rather it is referring to half of a *zuz* (*a provincial sela – half a dinar, which is one-eighth of a Tyrian sela – four dinars*). The term “*sela*” is used here in the *Mishna* as people would normally call a half *zuzan* “*isteira*” (*a sela*). (11a – 11b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

KIDDUSHIN BY NIGHT

The *Mishna* had stated: The monetary transaction, according to Beis Shamai, must be done with a *dinar* or the equivalent of a *dinar*.

The *Gemora* asks: What is Beis Shamai’s reasoning?

Rabbi Zeira answers: A woman is particular that she should not become betrothed for less than a *dinar*.

Abaye asks: If so, what about the daughters of Rabbi Yannai, who are generally particular not to accept *kiddushin* of less than three *kav* of gold *dinars*? Are you saying that if she would accept only a *dinar* from someone that it would not be a valid *kiddushin*?

Rabbi Zeira responds: If she would knowingly take this amount of *kiddushin*, indeed it would be valid. The case I am referring to is if she took the money at night (*and was*

unable to see the value of the coin). Alternatively, the case is where she made a messenger to accept *kiddushin* for her, and did not specify how much she wants.

The Mizrahi maintains that a *get* given at night is Biblically invalid. Accordingly, the *halachah* should be that *kiddushin* given at night is also invalid, for *kiddushin* is juxtaposed to *geirushin* (divorce).

The Acharonim challenge this ruling from our *Gemora* which clearly states that a *kiddushin* given at night is valid!?

The Shaar HaMelech writes that our *Gemora* can be referring to a *kiddushin* where the man gave money to the woman at night, for *kiddushin* through money is not derived from *geirushin*. The Mizrahi, however, is referring to *kiddushin* through a document. That will not be valid if done at night, for that we derive from *geirushin*.

Reb Elchonon Wasserman disagrees and states that the Rishonim who assert that *kiddushin* through money is not learned out from *geirushin* only say that with respect to the act of *kiddushin*, and that is why *kiddushin* is valid with using something that is connected to the ground (even though a *get* of that type will be invalid). However, with respect to the validity of the *kiddushin*, all types of methods of *kiddushin* are derived from *geirushin* (and then the *halachah* of invalidating a *kiddushin* occurring at night can quite possibly be derived from *geirushin*, even when it is done through money).

DAILY MASHAL

When he was an elderly widower, Rabbi Eliyahu Lopian was a guest for dinner at the home of a certain couple. At the end of the meal, the couple had to excuse themselves for something that required them to leave the rabbi alone for several minutes. When they came back, the couple was astonished to find that the venerable and humble

rabbi had, quietly and without any fanfare, washed and dried all the dishes.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM YESTERDAY'S DAF to refresh your memory

Q: What would be the difference if cohabitation creates betrothal (*erusin*) only, or if it also creates marriage (*nisuin*)?

A: The difference is whether he inherits her, can become impure to her (if she dies and he is a Kohen who may only become impure to dead close relatives), and annul her vows.

Q: According to Yochanan ben Bag Bag, Biblically, can the *arusah* of a Kohen eat *terumah*?

A: It is a *machlokes Amoraim*.

Q: Why does "simpon" not apply by slaves (there is no blemish that will invalidate the purchase).

A: A blemish does not nullify a sale by a slave, for if the defect is recognizable from the outside, the buyer has seen it (and he nevertheless purchased the slave). If the defect is on the inside, what difference does it make; a slave is meant to work and this type of blemish should not hinder the slave from working at all. If the slave is found to be a thief or kidnapper, the sale is valid anyway. What can there be that would nullify a sale? If he was found to be an armed bandit or a person sentenced to death by the government (which would nullify the sale), such characters are generally public knowledge. (Thus, there is no reason to prohibit a Kohen's slave from eating *terumah*.)