



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

Yevamos Daf Pey Aleph

MISHNA

- A woman who marries a sris chama who is a Kohen, may eat terumah.
- **R' Yose and R' Shimon** say, a woman who marries an androginas who is a Kohen, may eat terumah.
- **R' Yehuda** says, if the skin covering the organs of a tumtum is ripped off, and he is discovered to be a male, he should not do chalitzah, because he is considered to be a sris.
- An androginas may marry a woman, but may not marry a man. **R' Eliezer** says, if an androginas is mezaneh with a man, they would be chayuv skila.

GEMARA

- **Q:** It is obvious that the wife of a sris chama who is a Kohen may eat terumah (there is no issur to marry him)!? **A:** We would think that only a Kohen who can have children can cause his wife to eat terumah. The Mishna teaches that this is not so.

R' YOSE V'R' SHIMON OMRIM ANDROGINAS

- **Reish Lakish** said, the androginas allows his wife to eat terumah, but not chozeh v'shok. **R' Yochanan** said, he even entitles her to eat the chozeh v'shok.
 - **Q:** According to **Reish Lakish**, if he doesn't entitle her to eat the chozeh v'shok, why does he entitle her to eat the terumah (which is similarly a D'Oraisa)? **A:** **Reish Lakish** is discussing terumah in today's times, which is only D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** If that is so, that would mean that he would hold that an androginas does not entitle his wife to eat terumah when the Beis Hamikdash stood. If so, when he wanted to give an example to show the dichotomy of when he does entitle her to eat something and when he does not, why didn't he stick to the entitlement to eat terumah (instead of introducing chazeh v'shok) and say that when it is terumah D'Rabanan she may eat and when it is D'Oraisa she may not eat!? **A:** This is what he means to say. He is saying that in today's times he entitles her to eat terumah D'Rabanan, but in the times when there are the gifts of chozeh v'shok (i.e. when the Beis Hamikdash stands), he does not even entitle her to eat terumah D'Rabanan (e.g. terumah on vegetables or the like), because we are concerned that she may then mistakenly come to eat terumah D'Oraisa as well, which is something that she may not do.
- **R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, do you hold that terumah in today's times is only D'Rabanan? **Reish Lakish** said that he does, based on a Braisa that says that a cake of figs of terumah that became mixed in other cakes of figs can become nullified. It must be that terumah is only D'Rabanan, because if not, the terumah would not be nullified. **R' Yochanan** said, I have learned a Braisa that says that even a tamei piece of chatas meat can become nullified in pieces of tahor meat. Now chatas meat is clearly D'Oraisa, and still we see it may be nullified. Therefore, the proof from the Braisa with the cakes of figs is not a good proof. Rather, the reason the cakes become nullified is because they are not always sold by individual units, and only things that are always sold by individual units do not become nullified.
 - This difference of opinion is based on how they each understand the shita of **R' Meir** in a Mishna, where he says that things that are sold as individual units do not become nullified. **R' Yochanan** says that **R' Meir** refers only to things that are *always* sold as individual units, and **Reish Lakish** says that **R' Meir** even refers to items that are usually sold as individual units.

- The Braisa referenced by **R' Yochanan** regarding the piece of meat, states as follows. If a piece of tamei chatas meat becomes mixed in 100 pieces of tahor chatas meat, it becomes nullified. **R' Yehuda** says that it does not become nullified. However, a piece of tahor chatas meat that became mixed in 100 pieces of tahor chullin meat, all agree that it would not become nullified. This Braisa is a proof to **R' Yochanan**, because it says that pieces of meat (which are often sold by the piece) become nullified.
 - **R' Chiya the son of R' Huna** said, **Reish Lakish** would say that the Braisa is discussing meat that dissolved, which is never sold by the piece, and that is why it is nullified.
 - **Q:** If so, why does **R' Yehuda** say that it is not nullified? **A:** He is of the opinion that when something becomes mixed in its own kind, it does not become nullified.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is discussing meat that dissolved, meaning that meat that was not dissolved would not be nullified, why does the Tanna have to bring a contrasting case with a tahor piece of meat that gets mixed into chullin? Why can't he just say, that if it is dissolved it is nullified, and if it is not dissolved it is not nullified, which shows the same contrasting result!? **A:** The Tanna thought it was a bigger chiddush to teach that tahor meat that got mixed into tahor meat does not become nullified.