



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

Yevamos Daf Samach Vuv

MISHNA

- If a widow marries a Kohen Gadol, or a divorcee or chalutzah marries a regular Kohen, the "nichsei melog" slaves (the husband may use these assets, but they continue to be owned by the wife) that she brings into the marriage may not eat terumah, but the "tzon barzel" (the husband must simply return the value that the asset had at the time of the marriage, to the wife at the time of termination of the marriage) slaves may eat terumah.
 - Melug slaves mean that if the slaves die, she bears the loss, and if they appreciate, she enjoys the appreciation. Although the husband is obligated to feed these slaves, they may not eat terumah.
 - Tzon barzel slaves mean that if the slaves die, he bears the loss, and if they appreciate, he enjoys the appreciation. Since he is obligated to feed them, they may eat terumah.
- If a Yisraelis marries a Kohen (in a permitted circumstance), and brings slaves into the marriage, whether the slaves are melog or tzon barzel they may eat terumah. On the other hand, if the daughter of a Kohen marries a Yisrael and brings slaves into the marriage, whether the slaves are melog or tzon barzel they may not eat terumah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** In the first case of the Mishna, why can't the melog slaves eat terumah? A Braisa says that when something acquired by a Kohen has itself made an acquisition (e.g. his wife bought a slave), that "second generation" acquisition may also eat terumah. If so, why can't the melog slave in the first case of the Mishna eat terumah? **A:** Only someone who themselves may eat terumah may cause another to eat terumah. However, this widow may not eat terumah, and she therefore may also not cause her slaves to eat terumah.
 - **Q:** An uncircumcised or tamei Kohen may not eat terumah and yet he may cause others to eat terumah!? **A:** Such a Kohen is classified as being allowed to eat terumah. He is only temporarily not allowed to until he fixes his disqualification.
 - **Q:** A mamzer may not eat terumah, and yet we find that a child who is a mamzer would permit his grandmother who has become widowed from a Kohen to continue eating terumah!? **A:** It is true that even one who cannot eat terumah may at times allow someone else to eat terumah. The Gemara previously meant to say that any *acquisition* of a Kohen who cannot eat terumah cannot permit another to eat terumah.
 - **Rava** said, D'Oraisa the slaves of the widow may eat terumah. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that they cannot eat so that the widow will say to herself, "I may not eat terumah and my slaves may not eat terumah. It is as if I am not a wife at all, and simply a zonah!" These thoughts will lead her to get divorced, which is what the **Rabanan** want to happen.
 - **R' Ashi** said, the reason we are goizer and don't allow them to eat is because we are concerned that she will continue to allow her slaves to eat the terumah even after the husband dies, at which time it would truly be assur.
 - **Q:** Based on this reason, even a Yisraelis who married a Kohen when permitted, should not be allowed to give her melog slaves terumah out of concern that she may continue to give it to them after the husband dies!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the gezeirah was for the case of a Kohenes who was a widow and married a Kohen Gadol. In that case, the Kohenes would mistakenly continue to give her melog slaves terumah even after the death of her husband. She thinks that just as they

ate before she was married, they may also eat after her marriage is over. However, this is not true, because through the marriage she has become a chalalah, and therefore cannot permit her slaves to eat terumah.

- **Q:** This gezeirah would not apply when the widow was a Yisraelis (she would not think to continue giving them terumah, since she did not give them terumah before the marriage)!? **A:** The **Rabanan** did not differentiate between the different cases of a widow.
- If a woman brings tzon barzel assets into a marriage, and when the marriage ends she demands the return of the actual assets, whereas he says that he will give money equal to the value as recorded in the kesubah, **R' Yehuda** says, she is correct in her demand, because these assets are from her father's house, and should therefore be returned, and **R' Ami** says that he is correct, since our Mishna says that he bears any loss and appreciation and therefore if he is a Kohen he allows them to eat terumah, it must be it is as if he has acquired them at the time of the marriage, and may therefore keep them.
 - **R' Safra** said, our Mishna is not a proof, because the Mishna stops short of saying that the assets belong to the husband.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that an animal may be fed terumah only if it is owned by a Kohen, and not merely when it is the Kohen's responsibility to feed that animal (e.g. where he rented an animal). If so, when the Mishna says that the Kohen may give terumah to the tzon barzel assets, it must mean that he actually owns the assets!? **A:** It may be that even merely being fully responsible for an asset would allow a Kohen to give it terumah to eat. The case of renting the animal is different, because he is not fully responsible for the animal (he is not responsible for an oneis, or for depreciation of the animal), and that is why he can't give the animal terumah. In fact, the Mishna there continues, that if the Kohen has accepted full responsibility when renting, then he would be allowed to feed the animal terumah.
 - The Gemara brings a Braisa that says like each shita.
 - **Rava in the name of R' Nachman** paskened like **R' Yehuda**. When asked, **R' Nachman** explained, that although there is a Braisa that supports **R' Ami**, it is logical to say like **R' Yehuda**, since these are assets that are from her father's house and should therefore leave the marriage with her.
 - There was a woman who bought a cloak for her husband as tzon barzel. When the husband died, the children placed the cloak over him for tachrichin. **Rava** said, the cloak has become assur as tachrichin. **Nanai the son of R' Yosef the son of Rava** asked **R' Kahana**, we just said that **Rava** paskens like **R' Yehuda**, which means the husband doesn't own the tzon barzel property. If so, how could **Rava** say that the children have the right to make the cloak assur, since only one who owns it could do that? **R' Kahana** said, even **R' Yehuda** would agree that the tzon barzel is considered to be in the possession of the husband until it is collected by the wife. As such, the children of the husband have the ability to make it assur.
 - **R' Yehuda** said, if a woman brought 2 keilim of tzon barzel into a marriage, worth a combined total of 1,000 zuz, and at the time the marriage ended, each keili was worth 1,000 zuz, she may take one keili as the tzon barzel value in her kesubah and may then pay 1,000 zuz for the other keili, since it is an asset that came from her father's house.
 - **Q:** **R' Yehuda** has already taught that the woman may take such assets when the marriage ends!? **A:** We would have thought that he meant she may take the assets only up to the worth recorded in the kesubah. This second teaching teaches that she may pay and take the assets above the value listed in the kesubah.