



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

Yevamos Daf Pey Gimmel

- It was said in the Yeshiva of **Rav** in the name of **Rav**, that the Halacha follows **R' Yose** regarding an androginas (he says in the Mishna that an androginas is considered to be a definite male) and regarding grafting (that it takes 2 weeks for a tree graft to take hold, and therefore, a graft done before shmitta must be done at least 30 days and 2 weeks before the shmitta year begins). **Shmuel** says that the Halacha follows **R' Yose** regarding a woman who bleeds in labor (that we can attribute her bleeding to childbirth for up to two weeks before the childbirth, with the result that the bleeding does not make her a zavah), and regarding making something kilayim (that if one spreads his vine over his friend's grain, the grain does not become assur as kilayim, because a person cannot assur something that is not his own).
 - **Q:** How would **Shmuel** pasken regarding an androginas? **A:** We find that **Shmuel** told **R' Anan** that the version of **R' Yose** in our Mishna overrides the version in the Braisa. It must be that he paskens like **R' Yose** of our Mishna.
 - **Q:** How would he pasken regarding grafting? **A:** We find that **Shmuel** told **R' Anan** that one may graft up to 33 days before shmitta begins (like **R' Yehuda** says, and not like **R' Yose** says).
 - **Q:** How does **Rav** pasken regarding a woman in labor? **TEIKU.**
 - **Q:** How does **Rav** pasken regarding making something kilayim? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, that **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said that the Halacha does not follow **R' Yose**.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, why don't we follow the statement of **R' Ada in the name of Rav**, who said that the Halacha does follow **R' Yose**? **A:** When a statement is said to be made in the "Yeshiva of **Rav**", it refers to what **R' Huna** said in the name of **Rav**. Therefore, we must follow what he said on the matter.

R' YEHUDA OMER TUMTUM...

- **R' Ami** asked, how will **R' Yehuda** explain the tumtum of Biri, who had seven sons? **R' Yehuda** would say that those children certainly came from another man.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, a tumtum should not do chalitza, because his organs may become uncovered and he will be found to be a sris chama.
 - **Q:** Is every tumtum found to be a male? **A:** He means to say, that the tumtum may turn out to be a female, and even if it is a male, he may be a sris chama.
 - The difference between **R' Yose** (who says a tumtum is a possible sris) and his father (**R' Yehuda**, who says he is a definite sris), would be whether the tumtum's chalitza would prevent the other brothers from doing yibum, and whether the tumtum should do a chalitza when he is the only brother.
- **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda in the name of R' Abba the brother of R' Yehuda bar Zavdi in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a man who had bi'ah with an androginas would be chayuv whether he had bi'ah in the homosexual way, or with the female organ of the androginas.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** says the man would only be chayuv if he engaged in a homosexual act with the androginas!? **A:** **Rav** holds like **R' Simai** who says in a Braisa that he would be chayuv even if the bi'ah was done with the female organ.
 - **Rava** explains, **R' Simai's** view is based on the pasuk that says a man may not be with another man for "mishkivei isha" – plural. This refers to an androginas, and teaches that both forms of bi'ah are assur and make him chayuv. The **Rabanan** would say that the words "es zachar" teach that one is only chayuv when the act is done in the homosexual way.

- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** learn the simpler issue of a man's bi'ah with another man? **A:** From the extra "v'es".
- **Q:** How do they know that bi'ah with an assur woman would be assur even in the unnatural way? **A:** They learn it from the word "isha".
- **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Chisda** said, **R' Eliezer** does not consider an androginas as a definite male in every circumstance, because if he did, he should say that an animal that is an androginas should be valid as a korbon, and yet we see that he says it is passul.

R' ELIEZER OMER CHAYAVIN ALAV SEKILA K'ZACHAR

- A Braisa says, that **Rebbi** said, when I went to learn by **R' Elazar ben Shamua**, the talmidim ganged up against me to not allow me to stay. The one thing I was able to learn from **R' Elazar ben Shamua** was that **R' Eliezer** says that a man who has bi'ah with an androginas is chayuv sekila, as would be a man who had bi'ah with another man.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HE'AREL!!!