

2 Iyar 5782
May 3, 2022



Yevamos Daf 57

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Elozar said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya: If a *Kohen* (*petzua daka*) with wounded or crushed testicles (*who is forbidden to marry a Jewess*) performs an *erusin* with a daughter of a *Yisroel*; her ability to eat *terumah* would be dependent on the argument between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon. According to Rabbi Meir, who maintains that one who is awaiting a forbidden cohabitation is forbidden to eat *terumah*, this woman also cannot eat *terumah*. According to Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon, who hold that one who is awaiting a forbidden cohabitation is permitted to eat *terumah*, this woman also may eat *terumah*.

The Gemora asks: Perhaps Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon would not allow this woman to eat *terumah*. A *Kohen* who betroths a divorcee can entitle her to eat *terumah* because he has the ability elsewhere to entitle a woman to eat *terumah* (*if the Kohen marries a permitted woman*); however, a *Kohen* with wounded or crushed testicles cannot entitle his *arusah* to eat *terumah* because he never has that ability (*since he cannot marry anyone*).

Perhaps you will respond by saying that a *Kohen* with wounded or crushed testicles does have the ability to entitle his wife to eat *terumah* elsewhere; namely, if he marries a convert (*although a convert is a full-fledged Jew, they are not included in the prohibition against a maimed Kohen marrying someone from the “congregation”*). This is not a valid response because Rabbi Yochanan inquired of Rabbi Oshaya regarding this precise issue, and Rabbi Oshaya did not resolve this for him. (*It is evident that Rabbi Oshaya was uncertain if a Kohen with wounded or*

crushed testicles entitles his wife, a convert to eat terumah.) (56b5 – 57a1)

[The Gemora presents two responses to the objection to the comparison (*between a maimed Kohen and a Kohen marrying a divorcee*).] It was stated: Abaye said: A *Kohen* with wounded or crushed testicles does have the ability to entitle his wife to eat *terumah* when he becomes a *petzua daka* after his marriage, providing that he does not cohabit with his wife. (*She remains permitted to eat terumah.*) Rava said: A *Kohen* with wounded or crushed testicles does have the ability to entitle others to eat *terumah* in the case of a Canaanite slave or slavewoman. (*Abaye and Rava offer cases where the petzua daka entitles someone to eat terumah, and therefore they can be compared to the case of a Kohen marrying a divorcee, who also entitles his wife to eat terumah elsewhere.*)

The Gemora notes: Abaye did not present Rava’s case because he wanted to compare two cases of *kiddushin*. Rava did not present Abaye’s case because there she may continue eating *terumah* only because she originally had permission (*prior to her husband’s injury*). We are searching for a case where the maimed *Kohen* entitles someone to eat *terumah*.

Abaye, however, would respond that the logic of ‘because she originally had permission’ does not apply, for if you would not say like this, then a daughter of a *Yisroel* who was married to a *Kohen* and he then dies, (she) should be permitted to eat *terumah* (even if she has no children from him), for she originally had permission! Rava,

however, would reply that there (when the husband died), his acquisition of her has ended; but here, his acquisition of her has not ended. (57a1 – 57a2)

We stated before: Rabbi Yochanan inquired of Rabbi Oshaya: Does a *Kohen* with wounded or crushed testicles have the ability to entitle his wife, a daughter of a convert to eat *terumah*? Rabbi Oshaya was quiet and did not resolve this for him. Afterwards, another great man arrived and inquired of Rabbi Oshaya regarding a different topic, and Rabbi Oshaya resolved this for him. Who was this great man? It was Rish Lakish. Rabbi Yehudah Nesiah asked Rabbi Oshaya: Isn't Rabbi Yochanan also a great man (*doesn't he too deserve an answer*)? Rabbi Oshaya replied: He asked me something that I do not know the answer to.

The Gemora attempts to resolve this inquiry. If this inquiry is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah's opinion; then whether a maimed *Kohen* retains his sanctity, or whether he loses his sanctity, he should not have the ability to entitle his wife, the daughter of a convert to eat *terumah*. If he retains his sanctity, she should not be entitled to eat *terumah* because Rabbi Yehudah states that the daughter of a male convert is just like the daughter of a male *chalal* (*they are both forbidden to a Kohen, and therefore she would not be able to eat terumah*). If he loses his sanctity, she should not be entitled to eat *terumah* because Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the congregation of converts is considered the congregation of Hashem, and therefore a maimed *Kohen* would be prohibited from marrying her.

The Gemora continues: If this inquiry is in accordance with Rabbi Yosi's opinion; then whether a maimed *Kohen* retains his sanctity, or whether he loses his sanctity, he should have the ability to entitle his wife, the daughter of a convert to eat *terumah*. If he retains his sanctity, she should be entitled to eat *terumah* because Rabbi Yosi states that the daughter of a male and female convert is

qualified to marry a *Kohen*. If he loses his sanctity, she should be entitled to eat *terumah* because Rabbi Yosi maintains that the congregation of converts is not considered the congregation of Hashem, and therefore a maimed *Kohen* would be permitted to marry her.

The Gemora concludes: The inquiry must be in accordance with the following Tanna, for it was taught in a Mishnah: Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said: A daughter of a convert cannot be married to a *Kohen* unless her mother is a Jewess. The inquiry is: Although she is qualified to marry a *Kohen*, perhaps she is not included in the congregation of Hashem. Thus, a maimed *Kohen* would be permitted to marry her, and she would be entitled to eat *terumah*. Or perhaps she is included in the congregation of Hashem, and therefore would be forbidden to a maimed *Kohen*, thereby disqualifying her from eating *terumah*.

The Gemora says: Come and learn from the Baraisa which Rav Acha bar Chinana brought with him from the south. The Baraisa states: How do we know that a *Kohen* who has wounded or crushed testicles that marries the daughter of a convert, that she is allowed to eat *terumah*? It is written [Vayikra 22:11]: *And a Kohen who shall acquire a person, an acquisition of his money etc. he may eat of it.*

The Gemora analyzes this Baraisa: According to whose opinion is this Baraisa following? It cannot be Rabbi Yehudah's opinion, for he maintains that whether a maimed *Kohen* retains his sanctity, or whether he loses his sanctity, he does not have the ability to entitle his wife, the daughter of a convert to eat *terumah*. It cannot be representing Rabbi Yosi's opinion, for what why would we need a special verse to teach us that she can eat *terumah*; Rabbi Yosi holds that whether a maimed *Kohen* retains his sanctity, or whether he loses his sanctity, he has the ability to entitle his wife, the daughter of a convert to eat *terumah*. It is evident that the Baraisa is in accordance



with Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov's opinion. We can learn from this Baraisa that although she is qualified to marry a *Kohen*, she is not included in the congregation of Hashem. Thus, a maimed *Kohen* would be permitted to marry her, and she would be entitled to eat *terumah*. (57a2 – 57a4)

The Gemora states: Rav maintains that all the Tannaim listed in our Mishnah would hold that there is a legal significance for a *Kohen's chupah* (the entry of a bride into the husband's domain for the purpose of *nisuin*) to those women who are disqualified from the *Kehunah*. (Rav maintains that entering into a *chupah* disqualifies a daughter of a *Kohen* from the *Kehunah* even though it does not effect any *kinyan* at all; *chupah* is a preparation for cohabitation and the Rabbis decreed that she becomes disqualified.)

Shmuel maintains that all the Tannaim listed in our Mishnah would hold that there is no legal significance for a *Kohen's chupah* to those women who are disqualified from the *Kehunah*.

Shmuel said: Abba (Rav) will concede to me regarding a girl less than three years old that there is no legal significance to her *chupah* (and she will be permitted to eat *terumah*). Since cohabitation with a girl of that age has no legal significance, her *chupah* is not recognized either.

Rava said: There is a Mishnah that can be cited to support Shmuel's statement. The Mishnah states: A girl who is at least three years old can be betrothed with cohabitation, and if a *yavam* cohabits with her, he has acquired her, and if she is married and someone else cohabits with her, he would be liable for cohabiting with a married woman, and if she is a *niddah* and someone cohabits with her, he will become *tamei*. If a *Kohen* marries her (with *nisuin*), she is entitled to eat *terumah*, and if she is a daughter of a *Kohen* and a disqualified person cohabits with her, she becomes disqualified from eating *terumah*.

It can be inferred from this Mishnah that only if she is three years old can she become disqualified through cohabitation, and therefore can become disqualified through *chupah* as well; however, if she is under three years of age, she cannot become disqualified through cohabitation, she cannot become disqualified through *chupah* either. This is indeed a proof. (57a4 – 57b2)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

WIFE OF A KOHEN

Reb Elchonon Wasserman states a distinction between the wife of a *Kohen* eating *terumah* and the *Kohen's* Canaanite slaves and slavewomen. Although their entitlement to eat *terumah* is derived from the same verse, "An acquisition of his money," there is a basic distinction between the two of them.

A Canaanite slave and slavewomen do not have any elevated status by the fact that they now belong to the *Kohen*. The *Kohen* is permitted to feed his animals *terumah*, and so too, he can feed his slaves *terumah*. This is why there is no halacha regarding a slavewoman of a *Kohen* committing adultery and thereby disqualifying herself from eating *terumah*. She does not have an inherent right to eat *terumah*; the *Kohen* can feed her *terumah* if he so desires.

The wife of a *Kohen* is different. By virtue of the fact that she is married to a *Kohen*, she assumes an elevated status. She has a privilege of eating *terumah*; it is not necessary for the husband to feed her *terumah*. She possesses a higher degree of sanctity, but she can lose that as well. If she becomes a *zonah* or *chalalah*, she becomes disqualified, and cannot eat *terumah* any longer.

DAILY MASHAL

Understanding who is Asking # 2

The Gemora relates that Rav Oshaya only answered a question when a “great man” came along. Sometimes, the answer is dependent on the stature of the person asking the question.

Daf Digest (from the previous cycle) writes: The Ponevizher Rav, zt”l, once traveled to America to raise funds and found himself in a certain city whose native-born Rabbi was quite young and inexperienced. As was the custom, the Rav approached this person to help him raise funds. Before they set out to canvass the wealthier members of the community, the local Rabbi said to Rav Kahanaman, “We are sure to be successful with everyone except one certain baal habayis. The man is very wealthy but he never, ever, donates more than fifty dollars (in those years, a sizable sum) to any cause. The only exception was when he gave one thousand dollars to Rav Meir Shapira, zt”l, of Lublin.” Rav Kahanaman said, “Tell me what happened.” The local Rabbi related, “After the gevir told Rav Meir that he would donate fifty dollars, the Lubliner Rav asked to speak to him privately. They left the room together, and when they returned five minutes later, the gevir handed Rav Meir one thousand dollars. And neither would tell me why!”

The Ponevizher Rav decided to approach the gevir alone. When he arrived he said, “I haven’t come to ask for money. I only want to know what the Rav of Lublin said to you—the information might prove helpful with others.”

The wealthy man answered, “Rav Meir took me aside and asked me what I think of the local, native-born Rabbi? I told him that although he seemed a competent Rav, I never felt confident that he had enough discernment to tell who really deserves a large donation and who doesn’t. That is why I only give a standard fifty dollars. Rav Meir

then said: This is why we need a yeshiva like Chachmei Lublin—to train Rabbonim of the highest quality, because America is not yet ready to produce great Rabbonim! Naturally I gave as much as I could to the yeshiva!” The gevir continued, “Since you came alone, I see that you also understand the limitations of our Rabbi.”

Not surprisingly, the man offered the Ponevizher Rav a sizable donation without even being asked.