



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

Yevamos Daf Ayin

PEREK HE'AREL -- PEREK SHMINI

MISHNA

- A Kohen who is an arel (a male who never had a bris) or tamei may not eat terumah, however their wives and slaves may eat terumah. A Kohen who is injured as a pitzu'a daka or krus shafcha may eat terumah and their slaves may eat terumah, however their wives may not eat terumah. If his wife did not have bi'ah with him after the injury, she may still eat terumah.
 - A pitzu'a daka is when a man has even one of his testicles wounded. A krus shufcha is where his eiver is cut. If even a minute amount of the top of the eiver remains, the person is still allowed to marry into Klal Yisrael.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says, we learn that an arel is assur to eat terumah from a gezeirah shava from Korbon Pesach (on the words "toshav v'sachir", which refer to an eved ivri). This teaches that just as an arel may not eat a Korbon Pesach, he may also not eat terumah. **R' Akiva** says the double use of the pasuk "ish ish" teaches that an arel is assur to eat terumah.
 - We must say that the words of the gezeirah shava used by **R' Eliezer** are "extra" and open for drasha, because if they are not, we can ask that Pesach may be different, because it also has the issurim and kares liability of pigul, nossar and tamei. The Gemara says, the "toshav and sachir" written regarding Pesach is extra, because we have no reason to think that if a Jew becomes a slave that he would not be chayuv in Pesach. Therefore, the words must be extra to be used for the gezeirah shava.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** has taught that when a gezeirah shava is only extra on one side, we may still ask questions to refute it!? **A:** There are 2 extra words here (toshav and sachir). We look at them as if one is written by Pesach and one is written by terumah, and we consider it to be a gezeirah shava that is open on both sides.
 - **Q:** Once we have the gezeirah shava, we should say that just as an onein is assur to eat a Pesach, an onein should also be assur to eat terumah!? **A: R' Yose bar Chanina** said, the pasuk of "v'chol zar" teaches that only a non-Kohen may not eat terumah, but a Kohen who is an onein may eat terumah.
 - **Q:** Maybe this pasuk comes to allow an arel to eat, and not an onein!? **A:** We have learned that an arel is assur to eat based on "toshav and sachir".
 - **Q:** Why do we use the drashos to exclude arel and include onein? Maybe it should be the other way around? **A:** It is more logical to exclude an arel, because an arel is lacking an act, the act is to his body, he is chayuv kares, the mitzvah existed before Matan Torah, and one is not allowed to bring a Pesach if any of his sons or slaves are an arel. Although aninus has the characteristics that it exists at all times, applies to men and women, and has no remedy that a person can do to fix it, the arel has more unique stringencies, and is therefore the one that will be excluded. **A2: Rava** said, without the fact that arel has more stringencies, we would still learn out arel from Pesach rather than aninus, because arel is written explicitly in the pasuk of Pesach, whereas the issur of onein by Pesach is itself only learned from maser sheini.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that just as by Pesach, if one's sons or male servants have not gotten a bris, then the person himself may not eat a Korbon Pesach, the same should

hold true by terumah? **A:** The pasuk by Pesach says “bo” – which teaches that this Halacha only applies by Pesach.

- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the person’s himself being an arel also says the word “bo”, and should therefore teach that the issur of areilus also only applies to Pesach and not to terumah!? **A:** We have learned that an arel is assur to eat based on “toshav and sachir”.
- **Q:** Why do we use the drashos to exclude arel and include one whose sons and slaves are areilem? Maybe it should be the other way around? **A:** It is more logical to exclude an arel, because an arel is lacking an act to his own body and is chayuv kares. Although the issur of not having the sons and slaves with a bris has the stringency that it can apply at any time, the arel has more stringencies, and is therefore the one that will be excluded. **A2:** Without the fact that an arel has more stringencies, we would still learn out arel from Pesach rather than learn the areilus of his sons or slaves, because it is more logical to say that one is assur for his own deficiency than for the deficiency of his sons and slaves.
- **Q:** What does the word “bo” in the pasuk that says that a mumar may not eat a Pesach come to exclude? **A:** It teaches that such a person may not eat from the Pesach, but he may eat from maaser.
- **Q:** What does the word “bo” in the pasuk of arel come to exclude? **A:** That he may not eat the Pesach, but he may eat the matzah and marror.
 - The pasuk needed to teach regarding a mumar and regarding an arel. Each one could not be learned from the other, because a mumar is better in that he is not disgusting to Hashem (i.e. he has a bris), and an arel is better in that he follows Hashem’s Will.