



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

Yevamos Daf Ayin Daled

- The Gemara tries to answer the question posed – whether an arel may eat maaser sheini. The Gemara brings a Braisa that says, that one who had less than a full milah (there were strands left over) may not eat terumah, Pesach, Kodashim, or maaser. Presumably this refers to maaser sheini, and we see that an arel may not eat maaser sheini.
 - The Gemara says, it may be referring to animal maaser.
 - **Q:** Animal maaser would already be included in the term “kodashim”!? Don't say that Pesach should also be included in the term “kodashim”, because we would think that Pesach should be treated differently because the pasuk specifically says an arel may not eat the Pesach, and therefore if the Braisa would only say kodashim, we would think it refers only to the Pesach. However, maaser can't refer to animal maser, because that would be included in kodashim!? **A:** Maaser refers to maaser rishon, and the Braisa follows the shita of **R' Meir** who says that a Yisrael (and similarly an arel) is assur to eat maaser rishon.
- **Q: R' Chiya bar Rav Midifti** taught a Braisa that says that an arel is assur in 2 types of maaser. Presumably this refers to maaser sheini and animal maaser, and we see that an arel is assur to eat maaser sheini!? **A:** This Braisa also refers to maaser rishon, and follows the view of **R' Meir**.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, an onein is assur to eat maaser but is mutar for terumah and to do the parah aduma; a tevul yom is assur for terumah but is mutar for the parah adumah and for maaser; and a mechusar kipurim (he needs to bring a korbon to become fully tahor) is assur for the parah adumah but is mutar for terumah and maaser. Now, if an arel is mutar to eat maaser, the Braisa should have added an arel to the list, because an arel would be assur to eat terumah, but mutar for maaser and for the parah adumah! It must be that an arel may not eat maaser!? **A:** The Braisa may follow **R' Akiva**, who gives an arel the status of a tamei, which is why he would hold that an arel could not do the para adumah process.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna who argues on this view of **R' Akiva**? **A:** It is the Tanna who argues with **R' Yosef Habavli** in a Braisa, and says that an onein and a mechussar kippurim are both mutar to do the parah aduma process (and **R' Akiva** said that a mechussar kippurim may not do the parah aduma process).
 - **R' Yitzchak** also says that an arel is assur to eat maaser. He learns it from a gezeirah shava on the word “mimenu” written by Pesach and by maaser.
 - The Gemara says, these words must be “extra” and therefore available for the gezeirah shava, because if they aren't, we would be allowed to refute the gezeira shava, and could do so by saying that Pesach is very different in that it has the chumros of piggul, nossar, and tamei. The Gemara goes on to show that they are indeed “extra”. The word “mimenu” is written 3 times regarding Pesach (one to teach that only the Korbon Pesach is subject to the roasting restrictions and not the matza and marror, one is for the gezeira shava, and the last is used to teach regarding the nossar restriction of the Pesach), and it is written 3 times regarding maaser (one to teach that only maaser sheini may not be eaten by an onein, one to teach that oil of tamei maaser sheini may be used to smear on oneself, and one is to teach that tamei maaser may not be burned for personal use).
 - Although it seems that it is only extra on one side of the gezeirah shava, which according to some would allow for the gezeirah shava to be refuted, we can learn the last Halacha (regarding burning tamei maaser)

from somewhere else, thereby leaving one use of the word open for the gezeirah shava on both sides.

V'CHOL HATMEI'IM...

- **Q:** How do we know that someone who is tamei may not eat terumah? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** explains, the pasuk says "ish ish mizerah Aharon" who is tamei may not eat from the kodashim. The kodashim referred to must be something that applies to all children of Aharon (i.e. all Kohanim). This must refer to terumah, because that may be eaten by men and women alike.
 - **Q:** Maybe it refers to the eating of the chazeh and shok? **A:** This can't be what is being referred to, because a Kohenes who gets divorced from a Yisrael without having had children may again eat terumah, but may not eat the chazeh and shok.
 - **Q:** Terumah is not eaten by Kohanim who are chalalim!? **A:** A Chalal is not considered to be a "child of Aharon".
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that a tamei Kohen may not eat from the kodashim (which we explained to be referring to terumah) until he "becomes tahor". Why do we assume this means that he only needs to wait for sunset after going to the mikveh before eating terumah? Maybe he should need to wait until after he brings his korbon for full tahara!? **A:** A Braisa was taught in the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** that says that the pasuk is talking about a Kohen who became tamei in a way that he does not need to bring a korbon for his tahara.
 - **Q:** Maybe if he did become tamei in a way that he would need a korbon, he would have to wait until after bringing that korbon before eating terumah? Also, there is a Mishna that says that a tamei person can eat maaser as soon as he goes to the mikveh, he can eat terumah as soon as the sun sets, and can eat kodashim as soon as he brings his korbon. How do we know these halachos? **A: Rava in the name of R' Chisda** said, there are 3 pesukim that discuss becoming tahor to eat "kodashim". One says only mikveh is needed, one says sunset is needed, and one says that a korbon is needed. It must be that the first refers to maaser, the second to terumah, and the third to kodesh.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that first pasuk refers to terumah and the second refers to maaser? After all, they each have ways in which they are more stringent than the other!? **A:** The fact that terumah carries the death penalty (by Heaven) makes it more stringent and therefore requires one to wait for sunset before eating. **A2: Rava** says, the first pasuk uses the word "nefesh", which means it applies to every person, and only maaser sheini applies to every person.
 - **Q:** Maybe waiting for sunset is enough for terumah only when he was not tamei in the way that would require him to bring a korbon? **A: Abaye** said, there are 2 pesukim regarding a woman who had given birth. One says that she becomes tahor at sunset after her counting of days, and the other says that she must wait for her korbon to be brought. It must be that the first pasuk discusses terumah and the other discusses kodashim (which will be treated more stringently because it has more stringencies than terumah). **A: Rava** said, it can't be that the first pasuk refers to kodashim, because the person is clearly considered as somewhat tamei until the korbon is brought. A person who is tamei would make the kodesh meat tamei by touching it, and would thereby make it assur to eat.
 - **Q: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** asked, a Braisa says that the first pasuk is speaking to all women, including a geyores and a freed slave. Those women can never eat terumah (because they may not marry a Kohen). It must be that the pasuk is not discussing terumah at all!? **A: Rava** said, we see that the pesukim there clearly do refer to terumah. It must be that not all the halachos in the pasuk apply to all the people in the pasuk (and the pasuk therefore does discuss terumah).