



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

Yevamos Daf Ayin Beis

- A Braisa says, all 40 years that the Yidden were in the Midbar, the North Wind would blow every midnight. We can see this from the fact that Makas Bechoros happened at midnight, which shows that midnight is a time that Hashem shows favor.
- **R' Huna** said, if a person with a bris pulled his skin so that it looks like he did not have a bris, D'Oraisa he may eat terumah. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that he may not eat terumah since he looks like he never had a bris.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that such a person needs a new milah!? **A:** The Braisa is stating the Halacha D'Rabanan.
 - The one who asked from this Braisa thought that since the latter part of the Braisa brings a proof from a pasuk that such a person must undergo another bris, it must be that it is a Halacha D'Oraisa. However, in truth it is a Halacha D'Rabanan, and the pasuk is only an asmachta.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that such a person may eat terumah (which seems to mean even D'Rabanan)!? **TEYUFTA** of **R' Huna**.
 - **Q:** The above Braisa says that a tumtum may not eat terumah, but his wives and slaves may eat terumah. How can he have a wife that he would allow to eat terumah? It is a safek whether the tumtum is a man or a woman, and any kiddushin the tumtum is involved in is only considered a kiddushin l'chumra!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the case of the Braisa is where the beitzim of the tumtum are noticeable, and we therefore may treat him as a man. **A2: Rava** said, when the Braisa says his "women" may eat terumah, it means that his mother may eat terumah on account of him.
 - **Q:** It seems obvious that a tumtum's mother may eat on account of him!? **A:** We would think that only a child that himself can have children can cause his mother to eat, and since a tumtum cannot have children, he cannot cause his mother to eat. The Braisa therefore teaches that he can entitle his mother to eat.
 - **Q:** The end of that Braisa says that a tumtum may not eat terumah or kodashim. According to **Abaye**, we can say that the first case of tumtum in the Braisa refers to a tumtum whose beitzim are noticeable on the outside, and therefore is a definite arel, and the end of the Braisa (which doesn't discuss a tumtum's wife) is discussing a fully concealed tumtum, who is therefore only a safek arel (the tumtum may be a woman). However, according to **Rava** who said that even the beginning of the Braisa is discussing a fully concealed tumtum, why do we need a second case of tumtum? **A:** He would say that the tumtum mentioned at the end of the Braisa refers to a regular arel.
 - **Q:** If a safek arel (tumtum) can't eat terumah, why would the Braisa have to teach that a definite arel can't eat terumah? **A:** The Braisa is explaining, that the reason a tumtum can't eat terumah is because a tumtum is a safek arel, and an arel may not eat terumah or kodashim.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the shita of **R' Huna** is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, one who pulled the skin of his milah so that it looks like he never got a bris, a ger who converted when he already had a bris, a child over 8 days old, and all

other people who need a bris (meant to include one with two arlos), must have their bris done during the day. **R' Elazar bar Shimon** says, a bris on the 8th day needs to be done during the day, but the others do not. Presumably the machlokes is that the **T"K** holds that the case of one who pulled back his skin requires a new bris D'Oraisa (which is why it must be done by day) and **R' Elazar** holds it is only D'Rabanan? **A:** That can't be right, because all agree that a child even after 8 days old needs a bris D'Oraisa. Rather, we can say that all hold that one who pulled his skin only needs a bris D'Rabanan and all hold that a bris after the 8th day is D'Oraisa. The machlokes would be that the **T"K** darshens the conjunctive "vuv" of "u'bayom" to teach that all brisim must be done by day. The **Rabanan** then enacted that their Rabbinic brisim must also be done by day. **R' Elazar** does not darshen the "vuv" and therefore holds that only an 8th day bris needs to be done by day.

- **R' Elazar** said, if an arel sprinkles the parah adumah on a tamei person, it is a valid sprinkling. This is just like a "tevil yom" (a tamei person who went to the mikveh and now needs the sun to set to become fully tahor), who is also assur to eat terumah, but is valid to do the sprinkling.
 - **Q:** A tevil yom is different in that he is mutar to eat maaser, but an arel is not and may therefore be treated differently!? **A:** We are making a comparison to the touching of terumah, not the eating. We say that if a tevil yom, who may not touch terumah, may still sprinkle the parah adumah, then surely an arel, who may touch terumah, may sprinkle the parah adumah. A Braisa validates the sprinkling of an arel as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a tumtum mixes the parah adumah ash with the water it is passul, because he is a safek arel, and an arel is passul to do this mixing. However, if an androganis does the mixing it is valid. **R' Yehuda** says that an androganis is also passul to do the mixing, because he is possibly considered to be a woman, and a woman is not valid to do the mixing. Now, presumably just as the Braisa says that an arel may not do the mixing, he may also not do the sprinkling!? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, the Braisa follows the view of **R' Akiva**, who says that an arel is assur like a person who is tamei (based on the pasuk of "ish ish").
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, if it is true that the Tanna equates a tamei person and an arel, the Tanna would have grouped them together and said that these two people are assur. The fact that he doesn't must mean that they are the same only in regard to eating terumah, but not to touching terumah.
 - The machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** is the same machlokes that they have elsewhere. A Mishna says, the ashes and water of the parah adumah may be mixed by any person except for a deaf-mute, insane person, or a minor. **R' Yehuda** says a minor is valid, but not a woman or androgenus.
 - The **T"K**'s view is based on the pasuk "v'lakchu latamei mei'afar sreifas hachatas", which teaches that the people invalid to gather the ashes are also passul to do the mixing. **R' Yehuda** says, if this was true, the pasuk should have said "v'lakach", in the singular, as was said regarding the collection of the ashes. The plural form of "v'lakchu" teaches that a minor is valid for mixing as well. He says a woman is invalid because the pasuk says ""v'nassan", in the masculine form. The **T"K** says, the pasuk specifically uses the plural for "taking" and the singular for "placing" to teach that only one person need to take and only one person need to place, and it need not be the same person.
 - The pasuk of "v'hiza hatahor ahl hatamei" teaches that even a tevil yom may do the parah adumah process.