



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

The Value of a Perutah

The *Mishnah* had stated: Beis Hillel says: *Kiddushin* can be done with a *perutah* or the equivalent of a *perutah* (a smaller copper coin worth much less than a *dinar*).

Rav Yosef says: The *perutah* referred to by Beis Hillel is any *perutah* (regardless of whether or not it is as valuable as the previous *perutos*; in some generations, they subtracted from the weight of the *perutah*).

Abaye asks: Doesn't the *Mishnah* itself say: What is the value of a *perutah*? It is one-eighth of an Italian *issar*!? [This implies that it is a specific value.] If you will suggest that this was what it was worth in the generation of Moshe Rabeinu, but now it can be worth whatever it is worth, this contradicts a statement of Rav Dimi. When Rav Dimi arrived (from *Eretz Yisroel*) he reported that Rav Simai had evaluated how much a *perutah* was in his day, and it was one-eighth of an Italian *issar*. And when Ravin arrived, he reported that Rabbi Dostai, Rabbi Yannai and Rabbi Oshaya evaluated a *perutah* as being worth one sixth of an Italian *issar*. [Their argument will be explained later. The point presently is that these Rabbis required an evaluation for the value of a *perutah*, and did not use the *perutah* of their generation, for it was not worth the prescribed amount.]

Rav Yosef asked Abaye: If so (that a *perutah* has to be worth this much), how can we reconcile this with the *Baraisa* that states that there are more than two thousand *perutos* in two *sela'im*? There are clearly not even two thousand (if it cannot be worth less than one-

eighth of an issar). Why would the *Baraisa* say there are more than two thousand? [If there are eight *perutos* in an *issar* and 96 *issars* in a *sela*, it would emerge that there are only 1536 *perutos* in two *sela'im*!?!]

A certain elder answered him: It should read: close to two thousand (not more than two thousand).

The *Gemora* asks: Even so, there are 1536 *perutos* in two *sela'im* (according to this evaluation). Why is this called close to two thousand?

The *Gemora* answers: Being that it is more than half of the second thousand, it is called close to two thousand. (12a1 – 12a2)

The *Gemora* discusses a previous statement. When Rav Dimi arrived (from *Eretz Yisroel*) he reported that Rav Simai had evaluated how much a *perutah* was in his day, and it was one-eighth of an Italian *issar*. And when Ravin arrived, he reported that Rabbi Dostai, Rabbi Yannai and Rabbi Oshaya evaluated a *perutah* as being worth one sixth of an Italian *issar*.

Abaye asked Rav Dimi: Why don't we say that you and Ravin argue regarding the following *Tannaic* argument? The *Baraisa* states: The *perutah* that the *Chachamim* discussed was one-eighth of an Italian *issar* (as follows). Six *ma'ah* of silver equals one *dinar*. A *ma'ah* equals two *pundyon*. A *pundyon* equals two *issar*. An *issar* equals two *musmiss*. A *musmiss* equals two *kontronk*. A *kontronk* equals two *perutos*. It emerges that a *perutah* is one

eighth of an Italian *issar*. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: There are three *hadreis* to a *ma'ah*. Two *heinetz* equals a *hadreis*. Two *shamin* equal a *heinetz*. Two *perutos* equal a *shamin*. It emerges that a *perutah* is one-sixth of an Italian *issar*. [*Rabban Shimon agrees that an Italian issar is one-twentyfourth of a dinar. There are six ma'ah in a dinar, and three hadreis to a ma'ah. This means that there are eighteen hadreis, or thirty-six heinetz, or seventy-two shamin, or one hundred forty-four perutos to a dinar. This shows that a perutah (one hundredth and forty fourth of a dinar) is one-sixth of an Italian issar (one twenty-fourth of a dinar).*] shall we say that you are following the *Tanna Kamma's* opinion and Rav dimi is following Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's?

Rav Dimi answered: Both Ravin and I hold like the *Tanna Kamma*. The difference in our statements is merely depending on whether the *issar* went up or down. When the *issar* is strong, there are indeed twenty-four to a *dinar*. When it is weak, there are thirty-two to a *dinar*. (12a2 – 12a3)

It Might be Worth a Perutah in Media

Shmuel said: If someone betroths a woman with a date, even if a *kur* of dates is only worth a *dinar*, we say that she is betrothed, as a single date might be worth a *perutah* in (the country of) *Media* (where dates are not so common).

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't Beis Hillel say in the *Mishnah* that a woman is betrothed with a *perutah* or the equivalent of a *perutah* (but according to *Shmuel*, anything will work)?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not a difficulty, as this (*Beis Hillel's statement*) is to ascertain a definite *kiddushin*, and this (*Shmuel's statement*) creates a doubtful *kiddushin*.

There was a person who betrothed a woman with a bundle of feathers. Rav Simi bar Chiya sat before Rav and

was trying to evaluate whether they were worth a *perutah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Even if they were not worth a *perutah*, doesn't Shmuel say we suspect this is a *kiddushin*?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not a difficulty, as the difference is whether it is a definite *kiddushin* or a doubtful *kiddushin*.

There was a person who betrothed a woman with a stone of bluish-black marble. Rav Chisda was trying to evaluate whether they were worth a *perutah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Even if they were not worth a *perutah*, doesn't Shmuel say we suspect this is a *kiddushin*?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Chisda did not agree with Shmuel.

His mother asked him: On the day that they got married it was worth a *perutah* (and it went down in value, and therefore the *kiddushin* should still be valid)!

Rav Chisda replied: This is not sufficient testimony to forbid her to the second person (the case was where after receiving this *kiddushin*, a second person gave her *kiddushin* that was clearly more than a *perutah*). This is like the case of *Yehudis*, the wife of *Rabbi Chiya*, who was having labor pains (as she was giving birth to twins). She said to *Rabbi Chiya*: "My mother told me that in fact, my father accepted *kiddushin* for me when I was a minor from someone else." He replied: "Your mother cannot forbid you to me." [This incident proves that the testimony of a single witness is not believed to forbid the woman to a man.]

The Rabbis asked Rav Chisda: Indeed, why is this *kiddushin* not valid? Aren't there witnesses in *Iddis* who

indeed know that the stone was worth a *perutah* at the time the *kiddushin* was performed?

Rav Chisda replied: Now they are not here. This is similar to an incident with Rabbi Chanina, where Rabbi Chanina remarked, “Witnesses (*that a certain woman was captured, but she was not violated*) are in the North and she should therefore be prohibited (*to a Kohen*)?!” [Shmuel’s daughters had been taken captive (*which would prohibit them to Kohanim out of fear that that they were raped by their abductors*) and they came to the *Beis Medrash of Rabbi Chanina*. They both stated that they were captured and did not become impure. Rabbi Chanina ruled that they could marry Kohanim for the only way we knew that they were taken captive was through their mouths. In the end it was rumored that there were witnesses somewhere else that they had been captives and therefore the women should not be believed that they were not violated. Rabbi Chanina stated: “Now they are not here! Just because there are witnesses in the North, should she become forbidden!?”]

Abaye and Rava argued on Rav Chisda (*and said that if we know witnesses were present who presumably know it was worth a perutah then, we cannot permit a woman if it is not worth a perutah as far as we know*). If Rabbi Chanina ruled leniently to permit a captive woman, for she presents herself unattractively to her captors (*in order to prevent being violated*), will we also rule leniently to permit a potentially married woman (*to someone else*) on this basis? [Tosfos adds that in this case, if the witnesses would testify before us in *Beis Din*, she would become a married woman on a Biblical level, and therefore we cannot rule leniently. This is in contrast to Rabbi Chanina’s case, where even if the witnesses would testify before us, there would only be a Rabbinical prohibition.]

There were remnants of this family in Sura (*whose mother was the woman Rav Chisda permitted to marry the second person*), and the Rabbis separated themselves from this

family. This was not because they held like Shmuel, but rather because they held like Abaye and Rava.

There was a man who betrothed a woman with a myrtle branch in the marketplace. Rav Acha bar Huna sent her to Rav Yosef (*to ask*): What is the law in this case? He answered: Give him (*Rabbinic*) lashes as per the opinion of Rav, and a *get* is required because of the opinion of Shmuel. For Rav gave lashes to one who would betroth a woman in the marketplace, and for one who betroths a woman with cohabitation (*without giving money or a document beforehand*), and for one who would betroth a woman without a prior arrangement to marry her, and for one who would nullify a *get*, and for one who would pronounce that the *get* is being written without his consent, and for one who is disrespectful towards a messenger from the Rabbis, and for one who has been under an excommunication for thirty days and does not come to *Beis Din* to have it nullified, and a groom who lives in his father-in-law’s house.

The *Gemora* asks: Does this only apply to a son-in-law who lives there permanently, or even temporarily? Didn’t Rav Sheishes administer lashes to a son-in-law who temporarily lived at his father-in-law’s house?

The *Gemora* answers: In that case there were known suspicions regarding his mother-in-law acting promiscuously with him.

In Nehardea they said: Rav did not administer lashes for any of the above things cited, except for one who betroths a woman with cohabitation (*without giving money or a document beforehand*). Some say that he would give lashes even if the *kiddushin* was arranged beforehand, for acting in such a manner (*betrothing with cohabitation*) is immoral.

There was a man who betrothed a woman with a mat of myrtle branches. People asked him: But this is not worth



a *perutah*! He answered: She should become betrothed with the four *dinar* that are tied onto it. She took (*kept it in her hand*) it and was quiet.

Rava said: This is a case of keeping quiet after the acceptance of *kiddushin*, and is therefore invalid (*she did not know that it had four dinar tied to it when she accepted the kiddushin*). (12a3 – 12b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

MONEY; NOT DIRT

Shmuel said: If someone betroths a woman with a date, even if a *kur* of dates is only worth a *dinar*, we say that she is betrothed, as a single date might be worth a *perutah* in (*the country of*) Media (*where dates are not so common*).

The Ra"n explains that this is because she can say that to her, the date is worth a *perutah*.

This explanation is challenged by the Acharonim, for if so, the *kiddushin* should be valid even if it is not worth a *perutah* in Media (*similar to the incident involving Rav Kahana and the kerchief cited above*)?

The Pardes Yosef answers: In order for someone to say, "It is worth a *perutah* to me," it has to be regarded as "money," and not mere earth. It is considered "money" if it valued as a *perutah* somewhere in the world. If the date is worth a *perutah* in Media, the woman can say here, "It is worth a *perutah* to me."

DAILY MASHAL

PERUTAH

Today, the custom, based upon the Ram" a is as follows: Under the *chupah*, prior to the man giving the ring to the woman, the Rabbi asks the witnesses in the presence of the bride whether, in their opinion, the ring is worth a *perutah*, the minimum amount necessary for the

marriage to be effective. This is done in order that the woman should know that her husband is only marrying her with one *perutah* of the value of the ring, and the remaining value is a present. It follows, therefore, that if the ring were to be found fake, it should not affect the marriage. As long as the ring was worth a *perutah*, she cannot claim that she consented to the marriage under an erroneous assumption. Although she thought that her present (*the ring*) was worth more than it actually did, it cannot affect the marriage.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM YESTERDAY'S DAF

to refresh your memory

Q: According to Rabbi Zeira's explanation of beis Shamai that a *kiddushin* is not valid with less than a *dinar* because a woman is particular that she should not become betrothed for less than a *dinar*, what about the daughters of Rabbi Yannai, who are generally particular not to accept *kiddushin* of less than three *kav* of gold *dinars*? If they would accept only a *dinar* from someone, would the *kiddushin* not be valid?

A: Since they knowingly take this amount of *kiddushin*, indeed it would be valid.

Q: When must Tyrian currency be used?

A: Whenever a set amount of money is stated in the Torah.

Q: Can copper coins be used to redeem *ma'aser sheini*?

A: Yes.