



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

Yevamos Daf Ayin Hey

- **Q:** Why do we need 3 pesukim to teach us that a tamei person may not eat terumah until he has gone to the mikveh and had the sun set? **A:** The first pasuk only says that the Kohen must become tahor, but doesn't state specifically that sunset is needed. If we only had the second pasuk we would think that sunset is only enough when he is not tamei with the type of tumah that requires him to bring a korbon, we therefore need the third pasuk which discusses tumah that does require a korbon, and still says that only sunset is required. If we would only have the 3rd pasuk, we would think that sunset alone is sufficient. The first pasuk therefore teaches that mikveh is necessary as well.
 - **Q:** According to the shita who says that the first pasuk discusses a Kohen who is tamei (as a zav) and must bring a korbon to become tahor, and the pasuk refers to kodashim (not terumah), why do we need 2 pesukim (the second one discusses a woman who had given birth) that tell us that a mechusar kippurim may not eat kodashim? **A:** If we would only discuss a woman who had given birth, we would say it is only her who needs to wait until her korbon is brought, because she has a prolonged period of tumah, but a zav would not have to wait for his korbon to be brought. If we would only have the pasuk of zav, we would say that it is only he who must wait, because there is never an exception to his tumah. However, a woman who has given birth who does have an exception (her flow of blood during the first 40 or 80 days does not make her assur to her husband), maybe does not have to wait for her korbon to be brought. Therefore, both pesukim are needed.
 - **Q:** Why do we need the pasuk that says "bamayim yuva v'tamei ahd ha'erev"? It again teaches that we need sunset to become tahor for terumah!? **A: R' Zeira** said, this teaches that a tamei person may not even touch terumah until he has gone to the mikveh and waited for sunset.
 - Another way we learn out that a tamei person may not touch terumah until the sun has set is that we find that the pasuk refers to eating by using the word "touching". Since eating is referred to as touching, we learn that just as eating terumah requires sunset, the same is for touching terumah.

PETZU'A DAKA...

- **Q:** The Mishna says that if a woman is married to a petzu'a daka, but has not had bi'ah with him after the injury, she may continue to eat terumah. Who is this shita who says that one who awaits a prohibited bi'ah may still eat terumah? **A: R' Elazar** said, it is **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** (who argue on **R' Meir**). **R' Yochanan** said, our Mishna may even follow **R' Meir**, and the reason he allows this here (although he says elsewhere that such a woman would not be allowed to eat terumah), is because in the case of our Mishna she has already eaten terumah in the past, and she may therefore continue. **R' Elazar** would say that this would not be a reason to permit her to eat, because if it was a good reason, a Yisraeli who marries a Kohen and is then widowed should be allowed to continue eating!? **R' Yochanan** would say that case is different, because she is no longer the "acquisition" of the Kohen, whereas in our Mishna she is.

EIZEHU PETZU'A...

- A Braisa says, a petzu'a daka is one whose beitzim have been injured, even if only one of them are injured, even if they were only punctured, even if they only dissolved, and even if only a small part of them is missing. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** said, he heard from the **Chachomim** in Yavneh that if a person has only one of the beitzim he is considered to be like a "sris chama" (sterile because of a sickness) and is therefore fit to marry into Klal Yisrael (only a human caused injury, which makes the person unable to have children, is considered as a petzu'a daka).

- **Q:** Does the Braisa mean to suggest that a hole in the beitzim makes someone unable to have children? We have a story where someone's beitzim became punctured on a thorn and had children!? **A: Rav** had said about that case that it is clear that his wife was certainly mezaneh and had children from another man.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, one who is a petzu'a daka at the hands of Heaven is valid to marry into Klal Yisrael. **Rava** said, that is why the pasuk says "petzu'a" (as opposed to "ha'petza'a"), which suggests that the person became wounded after birth by human intervention.
 - A Braisa says, the pasuk of petzu'a daka and the pasuk of mamzer are next to each other to teach that just as a mamzer comes about through human intervention, the same is with a petzu'a daka.
- **Rava** said, "petzu'a" refers to wounding of any of the reproductive organs; "dach" refers to crushing of any of the reproductive organs; and "karus" refers to severing of any of the reproductive organs. This means, that the person gets this status whether any of these injuries happened to the eiver, to the beitzim, or to the strings attached to the beitzim.
- The **Rabanan** asked **Rava**, how do we know that petzu'a daka refers to an injury of the reproductive organs? Maybe it refers to an injury of one's head? **Rava** said, since the Torah does not give a number of generations for the issur to marry into Klal Yisrael (as by Mitzri, etc.), it must be that the injury is in a place which makes him unable to have children.
 - **Q:** Maybe it doesn't mention generations because it is only he himself who is assur!? **A:** We learn petzu'a daka from krus shafcha. Just like krus shafcha refers to the reproductive organs, so does petzu'a daka.
 - **Q:** How do we know that krus shafcha refers to that area? Maybe it refers to the lips, where a liquid also flows!? **A:** It refers to a place where liquid spills from. Liquid is pushed out forcibly from the lips. It does not simply flow out.
 - **Q:** Maybe it refers to the nose (where liquid does spill out)? **A:** The words krus shafcha suggest that until the injury this area ejects a liquid and after the injury is spills out. That is only true by the reproductive organs. **A2:** A Braisa says, the pasuk is written next to the pasuk of mamzer to teach that just as mamzer is created by those organs, the same is true of these injuries.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba** thought to say that when the puncture was at a diagonal so that it began below the top of the eiver and ended on top, the person would be valid. **R' Assi** told him, that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, any puncture at the top of the eiver makes him passul.

V'IHM NISHTAYER MEI'ATARA...

- **Q: Ravina** asked, when the Mishna says that there must be a minute amount remaining on top of the eiver for the person to be allowed to marry into Klal Yisrael, does it mean that there must be this amount around the entire part of the eiver, or is a majority sufficient? **A: Rava Tosfa'a** said, majority is sufficient, as long as it is on the upper part.
- **R' Huna** said, if one's eiver is cut diagonally like a quill, he is still valid, but if it is cut into like a gutter, he is passul. The reason is, that the gutter-like allows air in, and thereby prevents him from having children. **R' Chisda** says the opposite, because a quill-like cut does not allow the zerah to exit properly.
 - **Rava** agreed with the view and logic of **R' Huna**.
 - **Ravina** said to **Mareimar** that **Mar Zutra in the name of R' Pappa** said that in both these cases the person is valid. He was just unsure whether this is for a cut that is above or below the "atara".
 - The Gemara said, it must be where the cut was above the atara, because if it was below the atara, then even a cut in the eiver itself would be mutar.