



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

Yevamos Daf Pey Beis

- **Q:** According to **Reish Lakish**, since the Braisa is discussing a dissolved piece of meat, why in the second case of the Braisa, where the tahor chatas meat gets mixed into the tahor chullin meat, does the chatas not become nullified (since a dissolved piece of meat is so insignificant)!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, the first case of the Braisa is discussing where the meat became tamei with a tumah D'Rabanan, and that is why it is batul. However, the second case of the Braisa is dealing with allowing the chatas meat to be eaten by non-Kohanim, which is an issur D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is discussing tumah D'Rabanan, meaning that meat that was tamei D'Oraisa 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 tamei D'Rabanan it is nullified, and if it is tamei D'Oraisa 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.
 - **A: Rabbah** said, the first case of the Braisa only deals with an issur that is a lav (not to eat tamei kodashim) and therefore it is batul. The second case of the Braisa is dealing with an issur that carries kares (a non-Kohen eating kodashim).
 - **Q: Rabbah** himself says that once we are dealing with an issur D'Oraisa, we don't treat it differently, whether it is a lav or kares!? **A: KASHYEH.**
 - **A: R' Ashi** said, the reason why the second case is not batul is because it is a "davar sheyeish lo matirin" – the entire mixture may be eaten by a Kohen even if the kodashim is not batul, and that is why it does not become batul.
 - This is actually not correct. Davar sheyeish lo matirin means that something that is currently assur will become mutar to someone for whom it is currently assur. In this case, the kodashim is mutar to the Kohen all along, and is assur to a Yisrael (and will remain assur to him) all along.
- **Q:** We said earlier that **R' Yochanan** said that terumah in today's days is D'Oraisa. However, a Braisa says that if there are 2 boxes – one holding chullin and one holding terumah, and 2 smaller keilim – one holding chullin and the other holding terumah, and one keili fell into one box and the other into the other box, we may assume that the chullin fell into the chullin and that the terumah fell into the terumah. **R' Yochanan** says on that Braisa, that is true even if the chullin in the box was not more than the terumah in the keili (they were equal). Now, if he holds terumah is D'Oraisa, how could he be so lenient? **A:** He will say that this Braisa is following the view that terumah in today's times is D'Rabanan. However, he himself follows the view of **R' Yose**, who says it is D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** Does **R' Yochanan** really hold that we don't need a majority when dealing with issurim D'Rabanan? We find that **R' Yochanan** explains a Mishna regarding a mikveh to mean that one may put in passul water and remove valid water from the valid mikveh, only "ahd rubo" (until the majority). This suggests that he does require a majority even regarding this passul water for the mikveh, which is only passul according to the **Rabanan**!? **A:** He means that he may not take out more than half of the valid water (but having an equal amount of valid water and passul water would be okay, since it is only D'Rabanan. **A2:** It may be that he generally requires a majority even for an issur D'Rabanan. The reason why he allows the case where they are equal with the terumah and chullin is because there is the added chance that the terumah keili fell into the terumah box and the chullin fell into the chullin. It may be that there is no issur that must become batul altogether.

- **Q:** Our Mishna says that an androginas “nosei”, which suggests that he may get married l’chatchila, which would seem to support **R’ Yochanan’s** view, that an androginas is treated as a definite male!? **A: Reish Lakish** would say that the Mishna should be read as saying “if he gets married”, meaning that he should not get married l’chatchila. Just as the next part of the Mishna that says the androginas may not marry a male means even b’dieved, the beginning of the Mishna also is discussing where he married a woman, b’dieved. **R’ Yochanan** would say that the word “nosei” still means that it may be done even l’chatchila.
 - **Q:** From the fact that **R’ Eliezer** says in the Mishna that an androginas who lives with a male is chayuv skila, it must be that the **T”K** holds that he would not be chayuv misah, because the **T”K** is obviously uncertain whether the androginas is treated like a male or a female. This is problematic according to **R’ Yochanan**!? **A: R’ Yochanan** would say that the **T”K** and **R’ Eliezer** agree that he would be chayuv misah. They argue whether they are chayuv misah only for having bi’ah in a homosexual way or even for having bi’ah using the female organ of the androginas. **R’ Eliezer** says he would only be chayuv if done in the homosexual way, and the **T”K** says he would be chayuv misah even if done with the female organ of the androginas.
- **Rav** says, the shita of **R’ Yose** in our Mishna (that an androginas who is a Kohen entitles his wife to eat terumah) is contradicted and therefore overridden by what **R’ Yose** says in a Braisa, where he says that an androginas is a distinct being, which the **Chachomim** weren’t certain whether to treat it as a male or female.
 - **Q:** Maybe the Braisa should be overridden by the Mishna? **A:** Since **R’ Yose** in the Braisa left **R’ Shimon** and made the statement in the Braisa on his own, it must be that he retracted from what he had said in the Mishna.
 - **Shmuel** says that the Braisa is overridden by the Mishna.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that the Mishna is overridden by the Braisa, since we find that **Shmuel** normally follows the singular opinion when it is the more stringent opinion!? **A: Shmuel** does not hold that way when the opinion uproots something that was stated in a Mishna.