



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

Yevamos Daf Nun Zayin

- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya** said, if a Kohen who is a "pitzu'a daka" gives kiddushin to a Yisraelis, her status will be subject to the machlokes between **R' Meir**, and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon**. According to **R' Meir** who says that a woman awaiting a bi'ah which is assur D'Oraisa may not eat terumah, this woman could also not eat terumah. According to **R' Elazar and R' Shimon**, who say that such a woman can, this woman would also be allowed to do so.
 - **Q:** It may be that **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** only hold their view when the man can permit a woman to eat terumah in a permissible circumstance, but a pitzu'ah daka has no permissible circumstance and they therefore may agree that the woman he gave kiddushin to may not eat terumah!? You can't say that a pitzu'ah daka would allow a woman to eat where the woman is the daughter of a ger (who is possibly not assur to marry a pitzu'a daka), because **R' Yochanan** asked **R' Oshaya** what the Halacha would be in that case, and he didn't answer!? **A: Abaye** said that the pitzu'a daka who became so injured after already being married would continue to permit a wife to eat until they have bi'ah, and therefore he may allow her to eat in this situation as well. **Rava** said, since a Kohen who is a pitzu'a daka permits his slaves to be able to eat, it may be that he likewise allows the woman in our case to eat as well.
 - **Abaye** doesn't say like **Rava**, because he says we can't learn out a case of marriage from a case of purchased slaves. **Rava** doesn't say like **Abaye**, because he says that case is different, because he had previously permitted her to eat before becoming injured. **Abaye** says, the fact that she was permitted to eat previously plays no role in her future permissibility, because if it did, a woman married to a Kohen whose husband then died should be allowed to continue eating terumah! **Rava** says, that is not a good proof, because when the husband dies, his "ownership" over her has dissolved, which is why she can no longer eat terumah.
- We said previously, that **R' Yochanan** asked **R' Oshaya** what the Halacha would be if a Kohen who was a petzu'ah daka married the daughter of geirem, and **R' Oshaya** didn't answer, because he was not sure of the answer.
 - **Q:** According to what view was **R' Yochanan** asking? According to **R' Yehuda** he can surely not permit her to eat, because if a Kohen with such an injury still has the kedusha of a Kohen, he may not marry the daughter of geirem, and if he does, she is like a chalal who may not eat terumah. Even if such a Kohen loses the status of kedusha, **R' Yehuda** would not allow them to get married, because he says that a ger is also prohibited from marrying a man with such an injury, and she therefore would not be allowed to eat terumah based on such a marriage!? According to the view of **R' Yose** he can surely permit her to eat, because if this Kohen is still given the status of kedusha, he holds that the daughter of geirem may marry a Kohen and therefore would be permitted to eat terumah based on the marriage. If the Kohen is not given the status of kedusha, he would hold that the marriage would still be permitted, because he holds that geirem are allowed to marry a man with such an injury!? **A:** The question had to be according to **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, who says in a Mishna that a daughter of a ger cannot marry a Kohen unless her mother was a full Jew. The question is, is this additional requirement so that she is at a higher level of kedusha and can therefore marry a Kohen, although she is still also allowed to marry a man with this injury, and therefore, since the marriage is allowed she would therefore be allowed to eat terumah? Or do we say that this

additional requirement also makes her now assur to marry a man with such an injury, and she therefore may not eat terumah based on the marriage?

- **A:** The Gemara brings an answer to **R' Yochanan's** question from a Braisa taught by **R' Acha bar Chinina**, which said that a pasuk teaches that a Kohen who is a pitzu'a daka who marries a daughter of geirem permits her to eat terumah. This must be following **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** (because **R' Yehuda** would hold she is assur to eat, and **R' Yose** would not need a pasuk to teach this), and we see that he permits it.
- **Rav** said, that when chupah is done to a woman who is passul (e.g. a Kohen Gadol takes a widow to chupah without having done kiddushin or bi'ah), it has significance and prohibits her from eating terumah if she herself was the daughter of a Kohen who may eat terumah. **Shmuel** said there is no significance to such a chuppah. **Shmuel** added, that **Rav** would agree with him that the chuppah done to a girl less than 3 years old will have no significance (since she is not fit for bi'ah).
 - **Rava** said, a Mishna suggests like **Shmuel's** last statement as well. The Mishna says that bi'ah only has significance when the girl is more than 3 years old. This would suggest that a chuppah done before that time would likewise have no significance.