

**There it is different for he - <sup>1</sup>שעוה אחת מחיים -  
made her forbidden on him one hour while he is alive**

## **OVERVIEW**

explained that the reason she cannot eat תרומה in a case where her husband said 'הרי זה גיטין שעוה אחת קודם מיתתי', is because by making this stipulation that the גט should be effective while he is still alive, therefore even though that generally we are not concerned מת שמא, here it is different. תוספות explains the s'גמרא answer and subsequent challenge.

-----  
**פירוש הלך בעלה למדינת הים אוכלת בתרומה דהעמד בעלה בחזקת חי<sup>2</sup> -**

**The explanation** of this distinction is that in the משנה where her husband went overseas, she can eat תרומה since we place her husband on the presumptive status that he is (still) alive -

**אבל הכא אפילו נעמידנו בחזקת חי אסרה מחיים<sup>3</sup> -**

**However here** (when he said 'הרי"ז גיטין שעוה אחת קודם מיתתי'), **even if we will place** the husband **on the presumptive status that he is alive**, nevertheless she cannot eat תרומה, for **he prohibited her from eating תרומה while he is alive!**

גמרא cites the continuation of the תוספות:

**ופריך דלמא איהי מייטא ברישא ולא תאסר<sup>4</sup> מחיים:**

**And** רב פפא **challenged** this answer, saying; 'perhaps she will die first', so she **was never prohibited in his lifetime** from eating תרומה.

## **SUMMARY**

The dispute is whether this woman has a איסור or not.

## **THINKING IT OVER**

**Why should a חזקת חיים in the future nullify a current איסור?<sup>5</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> In our גמרא the text reads קודם מיתתו (instead of מחיים).

<sup>2</sup> He was alive previously, so as long as there is no known change this presumption continues.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote # 4.

<sup>4</sup> From s'רב פפא question it seems that the answer of ר"א בריה דר"י was that this woman has a איסור, for at some point in their marriage she will be אסור to eat תרומה (assuming that their life expectancy is the same; at the very end [at least] which is לעולם לאכול בתרומה, she will be שעוה אחת קודם למיתתו, therefore since she has a איסור, we prohibit her even now because of a ספק that he will dies shortly (See 'Thinking it over'). ר"פ challenged this assumption and maintains that she has no איסור; it is possible that she will eat תרומה her entire life, for she may die first!

<sup>5</sup> See footnote # 4 and זיו הים אות כ'.