

14 Iyar 5782  
May 15, 2022



Yevamos Daf 69

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

The Gemora cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that an idolater or a slave that cohabits with a woman has disqualified her from eating *terumah* (*we might have thought that she would become disqualified only by cohabiting with those men that can be legally married to her*). (68b – 69a)

The Gemora asks that according to Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that *kiddushin* does not take effect on women who are forbidden to him by a negative precept, the verse “*And if a Kohen’s daughter should become a widow or divorcee*” is seemingly superfluous.

The Gemora states the verse is necessary even according to Rabbi Akiva. If the Torah would only have written the laws regarding a widow, we might have thought that a widow is permitted to eat *terumah* when she had no children from her husband because she is still qualified to marry a *Kohen*; however, a divorcee, who is disqualified from marrying a *Kohen* may not eat *terumah* even if she didn’t have children from him. If the Torah would only have written the laws regarding a divorcee, we might have thought that only a divorcee, who had children from her husband may not eat *terumah* because she is disqualified from marrying a *Kohen*; however, a widow, who is qualified to marry a *Kohen* may eat *terumah* even if she did have children from him. (*The Torah wrote both a widow and a divorcee to teach us that they may eat terumah if they didn’t have children, and they cannot eat terumah if they did have children.*) (69a)

The Gemora cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that one who remarries his divorcee after she had been married

to someone else will not disqualify her from eating *terumah*. (69a)

The Gemora cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that a *chahal* (*the offspring of an illegitimate marriage specific to a Kohen’s forbidden marriages*) who cohabits with a woman has disqualified her from eating *terumah*. (69a)

The Gemora cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that the woman becomes disqualified from eating *terumah* by cohabiting with an unfit man, and not by being betrothed to him. It also teaches us that she will become disqualified with cohabitation alone, even without a betrothal first. (69a)

The Gemora cites the braisa mentioned above: A boy who is nine years and one day old, who is an Amonite, Moabite, Egyptian, or Edomite convert (*who are not permitted to marry into the congregation*), or is a Cuthean, Nasin, *chahal*, or *mamzer*, who cohabited with a *Koheness*, *Leviah*, or an Israelite woman has disqualified her from the *Kehunah*.

Rabbi Yosi states: Any man, whose children are disqualified, will disqualify a woman with whom he cohabits from the *Kehunah*. Any man, whose children are not disqualified, will not disqualify a woman with whom he cohabits from the *Kehunah*.

The Gemora asks: What is the difference between the two opinions?

The Gemora answers: The difference between them would be in a case where a second-generation Egyptian or a second-generation Edomite cohabited with a woman.

(According to the Chachamim, she would be disqualified, whereas according to Rabbi Yosi, she will not be disqualified because his son would be a third-generation convert, who is permitted to marry into the congregation.) The Gemora cites the Scriptural sources for their respective opinions. (69a)

The Gemora cites the braisa mentioned above: Rabbi Yosi states: Any man, whose children are disqualified, will disqualify a woman with whom he cohabits from the *Kehunah*. Any man, whose children are not disqualified, will not disqualify a woman with whom he cohabits from the *Kehunah*.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Any man, whose daughter a *Kohen* is permitted to marry, he would be permitted to marry his widow. Any man, whose daughter a *Kohen* is not permitted to marry, he would not be permitted to marry his widow.

The Gemora asks: What is the difference between the two opinions?

Ula answers: The difference between them would be in a case regarding an Ammonite or Moabite convert cohabited with a woman. (According to Rabbi Yosi, she would be disqualified, just like their children would be disqualified, whereas according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, she will not be disqualified because the daughters of these converts are permitted to marry into the congregation.) The Gemora cites the Scriptural sources for their respective opinions. (69a)

The Mishna states: A violator, a seducer, and one who is deranged does not disqualify a woman from eating *terumah*, nor does he entitle her to eat *terumah*. If these men are unfit to enter the congregation of Israel, they will disqualify her from eating *terumah*.

What is the case? If a *Yisroel* cohabited illicitly with a *Kohen's* daughter, he does not disqualify her, and she is still permitted to eat *terumah*. If she becomes pregnant because

of him, she is disqualified from eating *terumah*. If the fetus was cut up in her womb, she may eat *terumah*.

If a *Kohen* cohabited illicitly with a *Yisroel's* daughter, he does not entitle her to eat *terumah*. If she becomes pregnant because of him, she is still not entitled to eat *terumah*. If she gave birth, she may eat *terumah*. It emerges that the son's strength is greater than the father's strength.

The Mishna continues: A Canaanite slave, who cohabits with a woman, disqualifies her from eating *terumah*. He would not be regarded as her descendant to disqualify her from eating *terumah*.

What is the case? If a *Yisroel's* daughter was married to a *Kohen*, or a *Kohen's* daughter was married to a *Yisroel*, and she had a son. The son went and cohabited with a Canaanite slavewoman, and she had a son. This son is regarded as a slave. If his father's mother is a *Yisroel's* daughter who was married to a *Kohen* (and the *Kohen* and the son died), she cannot eat *terumah* (because she doesn't have any offspring from the *Kohen*, and a slave is not regarded as her descendant). And if his father's mother is a *Kohen's* daughter who was married to a *Yisroel* (and the *Yisroel* and the son died), she can eat *terumah* (because she doesn't have any offspring from the *Yisroel*, and a slave is not regarded as her descendant).

The Mishna continues: A *mamzer* will disqualify the *Kohen's* daughter from eating *terumah*, and will entitle the *Yisroel's* daughter to eat *terumah*.

What is the case? If a *Yisroel's* daughter was married to a *Kohen*, or a *Kohen's* daughter was married to a *Yisroel*, and she had a daughter. The daughter went and married a Canaanite slave or an idolater, and she had a son. This son is a *mamzer*. If his mother's mother is a *Yisroel's* daughter who was married to a *Kohen* (and the *Kohen* and the daughter died), she may eat *terumah* (because she has offspring from the *Kohen*). And if his mother's mother is a *Kohen's* daughter who was married to a *Yisroel* (and the *Yisroel* and the

daughter died), she may eat *terumah* (because she has offspring from the *Yisroel*).

The Mishna concludes: A *Kohen Gadol* can disqualify his grandmother from eating *terumah*.

What is the case? If a *Kohen's* daughter was married to a *Yisroel*, and she had a daughter. The daughter went and married a *Kohen*, and she had a son. This son is fit to be a *Kohen Gadol*, who may stand and serve on the *mizbeach*. He entitles his mother to eat *terumah*, but disqualifies his mother's mother from eating *terumah*. The grandmother can say: "There shouldn't be many like my son the *Kohen Gadol*, who disqualifies me from eating *terumah*. (69a – 69b)

The Mishna had stated: One who is deranged does not disqualify a woman from eating *terumah*, nor does he entitle her to eat *terumah*.

The Gemora cites a braisa that teaches a similar halacha. A deranged person, or a minor marry a woman, and they die childless, their wives are exempt from *chalitzah* and *yibum* (since it is not a valid marriage). (69b)

The Mishna had stated: If a *Yisroel* cohabited illicitly with a *Kohen's* daughter, he does not disqualify her, and she is still permitted to eat *terumah*. If she becomes pregnant because of him, she is disqualified from eating *terumah*.

The Gemora asks: Shouldn't she be prohibited from eating *terumah* immediately? Let us be concerned as soon as she cohabited that she might be pregnant? Didn't we learn in a Mishna above the following: (If two men betrothed two women, and if at the time when they entered the *chuppah*, they exchanged this one's wife for that one, and that one's wife for this one (and they cohabited with each other's wife), they are liable for cohabitating with another man's wife. The women go back to their rightful husbands.) They are required to separate from their husbands for three months, lest they be pregnant. We see that we are concerned for pregnancy.

Rabbah bar Rav Huna answers: We are concerned for pregnancy regarding genealogical matters, but not in regards to *terumah*.

The Gemora asks from the following braisa which indicates that we are concerned for occurrences happening in regards to *terumah*: If a *Kohen* says to his wife: "Here is your *get* on the condition that it should take effect one moment before my death." She is forbidden from eating *terumah* immediately because we are concerned that he will die the next moment.

Rabbah bar Rav Huna offers a different answer: We are only concerned for pregnancy in cases of cohabitation during marriage; however, in cases that involve promiscuity, we are not concerned for pregnancy (because women who engage in illicit relations invert themselves after cohabitation in order to avoid becoming pregnant).

The Gemora asks: Are we concerned for pregnancy in cases of marriage? But we have learned in the following braisa: If a *Kohen's* daughter was married to a *Yisroel*, and he dies, she immerses herself (in order to purify herself from the *tumah* from relations with her husband), and she will be permitted to eat *terumah* in the evening. (If there is a concern for pregnancy by marriage, she should not be allowed to eat *terumah*, for perhaps she is pregnant?)

Rav Chisda answers: She immerses and may eat *terumah* until forty days. If she is not pregnant, there is no concern; if she is pregnant, the initial forty days the fetus is considered water, and is not regarded as a child. (69b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### INVERTING HERSELF AFTER RELATIONS WITH HER DERANGED HUSBAND

Rabbah bar Rav Huna states: We are only concerned for pregnancy in cases of cohabitation during marriage;



however, in cases that involve promiscuity, we are not concerned for pregnancy (*because women who engage in illicit relations invert themselves after cohabitation in order to avoid becoming pregnant*).

Tosfos writes: A *Kohen's* daughter who is married to a deranged man is permitted to eat *terumah*. Although she assumes that her marriage is valid, she is concerned that she will not be able to tolerate him, and eventually will leave him. She therefore inverts herself after relations with her husband in order that she will not conceive and bear his children.

The Noda B'Yehudah (II Y"D:202) brings a question from Reb Zaruch Eidelwitz from Prague: The Tur (Y"D 331) rules that a *Kohen's* daughter who is married to a deranged man is disqualified from eating *terumah*. How can that be if the *kiddushin* does not take effect even Rabbnically?

The Noda B'Yehudah's son answers: The Tur disagrees with Tosfos, and maintains that a woman who is married to a deranged man is under the impression that her marriage is valid, and therefore she does not invert herself after relations. The Tur rules that she is disqualified from eating *terumah* because we are concerned that she might be pregnant.