



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Chagigah, Daf טז – Daf טז

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf טז---24-----

### HARIVI'I BAKODESH PASSUL

- A Braisa says, **R' Yose** says, we learn that kodesh has a level of revi'i in tumah, based on a kal v'chomer. If one who is a mechusar kippurim may eat terumah, but may not eat kodesh, then certainly a shlishi in tumah, which makes terumah passul will make kodesh into a revi'i. So, we learn that kodesh can become a shlishi from a pasuk (which the Gemara explains is the pasuk of "V'habasar asher yigah b'chol tamei lo yei'achel" – which can refer to a sheini touching the meat, thereby making it a shlishi, and the pasuk says that it may not be eaten), and that kodesh can become a revi'i from a kal v'chomer.

### UVITERUMAH IHM NITMEIS...

- **R' Shizbi** said, the only time the second hand makes the kodesh tamei is when the tamei hand is touching the second hand while it is touching the kodesh (we are concerned that the tamei hand will touch the kodesh as well). However, if it is not, the kodesh does not become tamei.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, **Rebbi** says that a dry hand will make the other hand tamei for purposes of kodesh. If we say that the chumrah of the Mishna is even when the hands are not touching, the chiddush of **Rebbi** would be, that even if the hand is dry, it makes the other hand tamei. However, if we say like **R' Shizbi**, what is the chiddush of **Rebbi**? Of course a dry hand will make the kodesh tamei, because it is based on a concern that the tamei hand will touch the kodesh directly (which would become tamei even from a dry hand)!?
- **Reish Lakish** said, a tamei hand only makes the same person's other hand tamei for purposes of kodesh. However, it will not make another person's hand tamei for purposes of kodesh. **R' Yochanan** said, it can even make someone else's hand tamei – however only the hand that was originally tamei can do this, and it can only make the kodesh passul, but not tamei. **R' Yochanan** said, I can prove my view from the seeming repetition in the Mishna. After stating the Halacha, the Mishna then repeats and says, "Because one hand makes the other tamei for purposes of kodesh, but not terumah". This repetition teaches that a hand may even make the hand of another person tamei for purposes of kodesh.
  - We find that **Reish Lakish** later changed his view to that of **R' Yochanan**.
  - **Q: Maybe** we can say that the question of whether the hand can make the kodesh tamei or only passul is actually a machlokes Tanna'im. A Mishna says that **R' Yehoshua** says that a hand that is a sheini l'tumah can make another hand tamei as well. The **Chachomim** said, a sheini cannot make something else into a sheini! This suggests that the **Chachomim** would hold that the hand could make the other hand into a shlishi (and **R' Yehoshua** would hold that it can even make it into a sheini), which would then only make the kodesh passul, and not tamei. **A: Maybe** the **Chachomim** mean that the hand which is a sheini cannot make the other hand tamei as a sheini or as a shlishi.
    - There is a Braisa where this is clearly the point of machlokes. **Rebbi** says that even a dry hand can make the other hand tamei to make kodesh tamei, whereas **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that it can make the kodesh passul, but not tamei.

### OCHLIN OCHLIM NEGUVIN B'YADAYIM M'SO'AVOS...

- **R' Chanina ben Antignos** explains in a Braisa that the chumrah referred to in the Mishna is, that if one has hands that are a sheini, and he has someone else put kodesh into his mouth, he may then not put dry *chullin* food into his mouth at the same time, because we are concerned that when he places the *chullin* food into his mouth, he may touch the kodesh and make it tamei. The **Rabanan** only instituted this gezeirah for kodesh, but not for terumah.

### HA'ONEIN UMECHUSAR KIPPURIM...

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The reason the **Rabanan** required this tevila is, since they were assur to eat kodesh up until this point, we require them to be toivel before beginning to eat it.

### -----Daf דב--25-----

#### MISHNA

- The following is the chumrah of terumah over kodesh: in the land of Yehudah, although we trust an ahm haaretz to keep wine and oil of kodesh as tahor at any point in the year, we only trust them to keep wine and oil of terumah as tahor during the wine pressing and olive pressing seasons.
  - If an ahm haaretz brings wine of terumah to a Kohen after the pressing season, the Kohen may not accept it. However, the ahm haaretz may put away the wine until the next pressing season and give it to a Kohen then. If after the pressing season, the ahm haaretz told the Kohen that he separated a revi'is of kodesh wine into this barrel, he is believed regarding the tahor status of the entire barrel.
  - Regarding keilim that were used for wine of kodesh, chullin, and terumah, the ahm haaretz is believed regarding their tahor status during the pressing season, and for 70 days before the pressing season.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to suggest that the ahmei haaretz are only believed regarding the kodesh oil and wine in Yehuda, but not in the Galil. Why would that be so? **A: Reish Lakish** explained, to bring wine or oil from the Galil to the Beis Hamikdash, one would have to cross over a strip of land of the Kutim. This land is considered to be “chutz laaretz” and as such will make tamei any food that is carried through it.
  - **Q:** Why can't the wine and oil be placed into an enclosed box, thus shielding from tumah as it is carried through!? **A:** The Mishna follows **Rebbi**, who says that a moving “ohel” does not shield the items inside from tumah.
  - **Q:** Why can't the wine and oil be brought in a sealed earthenware keili, which protects the items inside from tumah!? **A: R' Eliezer** said, an earthenware keili does not have the ability to protect kodesh from becoming tamei.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that the parah adumah water cannot be protected by an earthenware keili. This would suggest that kodesh could be protected by it!? **A:** The inference from the Braisa is that water not yet mixed with the parah adumah ash could be protected, not that kodesh could be protected.
  - **Q: Ulla** said that the chavereim prepare wine and oil in the Galil, to be used for kodesh!? **A:** They would put it away for when Elyahu will come and make the land of the Kutim tahor.

#### U'BISHAS HAGITOS NE'EMANIN AHF AHL HATERUMAH

- **Q:** A Mishna says that a Kohen may only accept terumah from an ahm haaretz before the gathering of the olives is completed (which is before they can become tamei, because we do not trust the ahm haaretz regarding tumah). This seems to say different than our Mishna, which allows the Kohen to accept the terumah at any point in the pressing season!? **A: R' Nachman** said, our Mishna is talking about the early crop, and the other Mishna is talking about the late crop (which is processed after the pressing season). **A2: R' Yosef** said, the other Mishna is discussing olives in the Galil, where the ahmei haaretz are not trusted at all.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that even in the Galil the ahmei haaretz are believed during the pressing season!? **A:** We must answer like **R' Nachman** said.

#### AVRU HAGITOS V'HABADIM V'HEYVI'U LO CHAVIS SHEL YAYIN...

- **Q:** They asked **R' Sheishes**, if the Kohen took the terumah from the ahm haaretz at a time when he shouldn't have, may the Kohen put it away until the next pressing season and eat it then? **A:** He answered, a Mishna says that if a chaver and his brother who is an ahm haaretz inherit from their father who is also an ahm haaretz, the chaver may split up each category so that he receives the portion that cannot have become tamei, but cannot take one category and have his brother take another category in exchange. A Braisa explains, that if the chaver receives liquid terumah, he must burn it. Now, if the Kohen can just put terumah of an ahm haaretz away until

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the next pressing season, why must the chaver burn this terumah? It must be that he may not leave it over for the next season.

- The Gemara says, it may be that the terumah discussed has no pressing season (like date beer), and that is the reason it must be destroyed.
  - **Q:** Why can't he put it away for Yom Tov, at which time the **Rabanan** said we need not consider the ahm haaretz's things as tamei? **A:** The items discussed is something that cannot be preserved until Yom Tov.

### V'IHM AMAR HIFRASHTI L'TOCHA...

- A Mishna says that we are meikel in some ways (by allowing it to be checked and deemed tahor) regarding the tumah of a "beis hapras" (which is only D'Rabanan) to allow someone to go and bring his Korbon Pesach (so as not to prevent him from doing a mitzvah which carries the kares penalty if not done), but not for one to go and eat terumah (since one who eats terumah while tamei is chayuv misah from Heaven).
  - **Q:** If it was checked for purposes of one's Korbon Pesach, is it now also considered as checked for purposes of terumah? **A:** **Ulla** said it would be mutar for purposes of terumah, and **Rabbah bar Ulla** said that it would remain assur.
    - An Elder said to **Rabbah bar Ulla**, our Mishna is a proof against you. The Mishna said that if there is some kodesh wine in the terumah wine, the ahm haaretz is believed regarding the whole barrel. Similarly, once we have checked for purposes of Pesach, it should be considered checked for purposes of terumah.

### KADEI YAYIN V'KADEI SHEMEN...

- A Braisa says that an ahm haaretz is not believed regarding the tahor status of bottles or regarding the tahor status of terumah.
  - **Q:** What bottles are we talking about? If they are bottles of kodesh, he should be believed just as he is believed on the kodesh itself. If it refers to bottles of terumah, that is obvious, since he is not believed on the terumah itself!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing empty bottles of kodesh at any point during the year, and bottles full with terumah even during the pressing season.
    - **Q:** Our Mishna seems to say that an ahm haaretz is believed regarding the barrels of chullin mixed, presumably with terumah, during the pressing season!? **A:** In the yeshiva of **R' Chiya** they said, it means the barrels of chullin were mixed with kodesh. Only then is he believed.

### KODEM LAGITOS SHIVIM YOM

- **Abaye** said, we can learn from here that 70 days before the pressing season, a sharecropper must begin to be busy with the keilim needed for the pressing season.

## -----Daf 12---26-----

### MISHNA

- From the city of Modi'im and inward towards Yerushalayim, an ahm haaretz is trusted regarding the tahor status of earthenware keilim (since they may not be made in Yerushalayim (because the oven needed to make them would cause a lot of smoke, and were therefore prohibited in Yerushalayim) these keilim were in short supply and had to be bought from the ahmei haaretz in the surrounding cities, to use for purposes of kodesh). From Modi'im and outward away from Yerushalayim, they are not believed.
  - How is this so? If a potter who is selling pots comes inward of Modi'im, this potter and these pots, may be trusted by these customers (who saw him enter with his pots). If he went outward beyond Modi'im, he is not believed.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, that Modi'im itself is sometimes treated as within and sometimes as beyond. If the potter is leaving the area "within" and enters Modi'im, as the chaver is entering Modi'im from "beyond", it is treated as the area that is "within". If they are both entering Modi'im from "beyond", or both are entering from "within", it is treated as "beyond".

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** said, our Mishna can be a proof to this. The beginning of the Mishna suggests that Modi'im itself is not "within", and the later part of the Mishna suggests that it is. It must be that it depends on the situation, as stated in the Braisa.
- A Braisa says, they are only believed regarding small earthenware keilim used for kodesh.
  - **Reish Lakish** said this refers to a keili that can be held in one hand. **R' Yochanan** said a keili may be considered as small even if it must be held in two hands.
  - **Reish Lakish** said, the ahm haaretz is only believed regarding these keilim if they are empty. **R' Yochanan** said, they are believed even if they are full, and even if they are full with his liquid or his garments.
    - **Rava** said, **R' Yochanan** would agree that the liquid itself (of the ahm haaretz) would be tamei. We find other examples where a keili has one status, while what is held within the keili has a different status.

### MISHNA

- Jewish tax collectors who enter a house, and thieves who return a keili that they stole, are believed to say that they didn't touch a keili, for purposes of kodesh.
- In Yerushalayim the ahmei haaretz are believed regarding the tahor status of kodesh, but not terumah. During the Yomim Tovim, they are even believed regarding terumah as well.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** A Mishna says that when tax collectors enter a house, the entire house becomes tamei!? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing where there is no goy there with him, whereas this Mishna is discussing where there is a goy there with him.
  - **Q:** Why is the Halacha different when a goy is there with him? **A: R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** argue: one says the fear caused by the goy will surely cause the collector to touch every keili in the house. The other says that the fear of the king will cause him to do so. The difference between these reasons would be where the goy is not a person of importance (and therefore will not cause the Yid to fear).

### V'CHEIN HAGANAVIM SHEHECHEZIRU ES HAKEILIM

- **Q:** A Mishna says that anywhere that thieves walk within a house is considered to be tamei (because he may have touched the keilim in that area), so surely a keili that he took and returned should be tamei!? **A: R' Pinchas in the name of Rava** said, our Mishna is discussing where the thieves did teshuva, as is evident from the fact that they are returning the stolen goods. That is why they are believed.

### U'BIYERUSHALAYIM NE'EMANIN AHL HAKODESH

- A Braisa says, in Yerushalayim the ahmei haaretz are even trusted regarding large earthenware keilim for purposes of kodesh.
  - The reason for this leniency is that we don't allow the ovens to make these keilim in Yerushalayim (as stated earlier).

### U'BISHAAS HAREGEL AHF AHL HATERUMAH

- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, we learn this from the pasuk that says that all the Yidden gathered to the city "k'ish echad chaveirem". The pasuk calls all Yidden with the title of a chaver.

### MISHNA

- If one opens a new barrel of wine or makes a new dough to sell on Yom Tov in Yerushalayim (when all are treated as tahor), **R' Yehuda** says he may continue selling any remaining merchandise from this even after Yom Tov (and treat it as tahor). The **Chachomim** say he may not continue selling the leftovers (because it is tamei from the touching of the ahmei haaretz).

### GEMARA

- **R' Ami** and **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** were talking. One asked, (according to the **Chachomim**) may the seller put away the leftovers for the next Yom Tov and sell it then? The other answered, everyone has touched it and you think

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

it can be left over until the next Yom Tov!? The first one replied, the entire Yom Tov it was touched by everyone and it wasn't a problem! The other responded, during Yom Tov the Torah treats an ahm haaretz as tahor, but once the Yom Tov passes, he is considered as tamei!

- Maybe this is a machlokes Tanna'im, because one Braisa says it may be left over until the next Yom Tov, and another Braisa says that it may not.
  - It may be that the first Braisa follows **R' Yehuda** and the second Braisa follows the **Chachomim**.
    - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda** there is no need to wait until the next Yom Tov, because he says it may continue to be sold after the Yom Tov!? **A:** The first Braisa may follow the **Rabanan** and the second may follow **R' Yehuda**, and the Braisa means to say that it need not be left over, because it may be sold immediately after the Yom Tov.

### MISHNA

- When the Yom Tov is over, they remove the keilim from the Azarah to make them tahor (for having been touched by ahmei haaretz, whose touch is only considered to be tahor during the Yom Tov, but retroactively is treated as tamei once Yom Tov is over). If Yom Tov ended on Thursday, they would not remove the keilim on Friday, out of respect for Shabbos (to allow the Kohanim to have time to prepare for Shabbos). **R' Yehuda** said, they would also not remove keilim on a Thursday (if Yom Tov ended on Wednesday), because the Kohanim are not available on that day either.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa explains, when Yom Tov ends on Wednesday, the Kohanim are busy removing the ashes from the Mizbe'ach on Thursday.

### MISHNA

- How do they remove the keilim (i.e. which keilim) to make them tahor? All the keilim that were in the Beis Hamikdash over Yom Tov would need tevila.
- Throughout Yom Tov they would tell the Kohanim who were ahmei haaretz, "Be careful that you don't touch the Shulchan" (since that could not be toiveled after Yom Tov).
- There were duplicates and triplicates of all keilim, so that if one became tamei, its replacement could be used.
- All keilim in the Mikdash needed tevila after Yom Tov except for the Golden Mizbe'ach and the Copper Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** says this is so because they have the status of earth, which can't become tamei. The **Chachomim** say this is so because they are plated.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says that the Kohanim ahmei haaretz would be warned not to touch the Shulchan and the Menorah.
  - Our Mishna held that regarding the Shulchan the pasuk says "tamid", which is why it can't be removed to be toiveled. However, the Menorah could be removed to be toiveled. The Braisa holds that since the pasuk says "v'es hamenorah nochach hashulchan", it is as if it says "tamid" regarding the menorah as well. Our Mishna would hold that this pasuk was written to teach where to place the Menorah.
- **Q:** The Shulchan is permanently in place, and as such should not be able to become tamei!? **A:** The Shulchan was meant to be moved, as **Reish Lakish** taught, the Shulchan was lifted during Yom Tov for all to see the tremendous miracle that the bread remained warm from one Shabbos to the next.
  - **Q:** The Shulchan would become tamei even if it was permanently in place, never to be moved, because it is plated with gold (a metal)!? Even though **Reish Lakish** said that that is only true for ordinary wood plated with metal, but not for expensive wood (which is what the Shulchan was made of), **R' Yochanan** said that it is true even for expensive wood covered with metal! Also, we have learned that the plating gives it the status of a metal keili even if the plating is not permanently affixed to the wood with nails or the like! **A:** A pasuk refers to the Shulchan as "wood". Therefore, it retains its status as a wooden keili (which only becomes tamei if it is meant to be moved even when full).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk just referenced refers to the Shulchan first as a mizbe'ach, and then as a table. **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** both said, this teaches that when the Beis Hamikdash stood, the Mizbe'ach provided kaparah. Now, after the Churban, a person's table provides the kaparah (by inviting guests to join his meal).

-----Daf תנ"ך---27-----

KOL HAKEILIM SHEBAMIKDASH YEISH LAHEM SHNIYEM...

- The Copper Mizbe'ach is treated as earth based on a pasuk ("Mizbach adamah taaseh li"). The Golden Mizbe'ach is compared to the copper one based on a pasuk that says "Mizbichos".

V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM MIPNEI SHEHEIN METZUPIN

- **Q:** The fact that they are plated is a reason to say that they *do* become tamei, not that they *don't* become tamei!? **A:** We must change the Mishna to read that the **Chachomim** say they are *tamei* because they are plated. **A2:** The **Chachomim** are responding to **R' Eliezer**, who says we need the pasuk to teach that the Mizbe'ach is treated as earth. They say to him, you think the pasuk is needed because otherwise they would become tamei based on their metal plating. However, you are wrong, because the plating becomes batul to their wood, since the pasuk refers to them as being of wood.
- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Elazar** said, the fire of Gehenom will have no power over talmidei chachomim, based on a kal v'chomer. If one is protected from fire by smearing himself with the blood of a salamander, which itself is only an offspring of fire, the talmidei chachomim, who are considered to be fire themselves (based on a pasuk) are surely protected from the fire of Gehenom!
- **Reish Lakish** said, the fire of Gehenom will have no power even over the sinners of the Yidden, based on a kal v'chomer. If the Golden Mizbe'ach, which had only a dinar's thickness of gold, was protected from its fire for all those years, the sinners, which a pasuk teaches are full of mitzvos like a pomegranate, will surely be protected from the fires of Gehenom!

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHOMER BAKODESH!!!**

**HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA CHAGIGAH!!!**

**HADRAN ALACH SEDER MOED!!!**

**MAZAL TOV!!!**



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Yevamos, Daf כ – Daf ט

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ---2-----

### SEDER NASHIM

#### MESECHTA YEVAMOS

#### PEREK CHAMEISH ESREI NASHIM -- PEREK RISHON

#### MISHNA

- There are 15 women who exempt their co-wives, and even the co-wives of their co-wives (if Sarah and Rivka are co-wives, and their husband dies, and Rivka then marries another man who is also married to Leah, Leah would be considered the co-wife of the co-wife of Sarah) from having to undergo chalitza or yibum (if their husband were to die without leaving any descendants) forever and ever (the exemption carries over to every new marriage and every new co-wife forever). The following is a list of these 15 women who would patur their co-wives, if these women had any of the following relationships with the brother of the deceased who stands to do yibum or chalitza (i.e. the “yavam”): the yavam’s daughter, his daughter’s daughter, his son’s daughter, his wife’s daughter, his wife’s son’s daughter, his wife’s daughter’s daughter, his mother in law, his mother in law’s mother, his father in law’s mother, his maternal sister, his mother’s sister, his wife’s sister, his maternal brother’s wife, the wife of his brother who died before the yavam was born, and his daughter in law. These 15 women patur their co-wives, and the co-wives of their co-wives from chalitza and yibum, forever and ever.
  - However, if any of these 15 women died before their husband, had their marriage annulled through “miun”, were divorced before their husbands died, or if the woman was found to be an “ailunis” (never fully matured and incapable of having children, thus rendering her marriage annulled as a “mekach taus”, a purchase in error), their co-wives become mutar to the living brother for yibum. Obviously, the case of the mother in law, her mother, and the father in law’s mother cannot be a case of ailunis (since they had children) or miun (since that may only be done by a minor).
  - How do these 15 women patur their co-wives? If a person’s daughter or one of the other arayos were married to his brother who also had another wife, and his brother died without children, just as his daughter is patur from chalitza and yibum, so too is the co-wife patur as well.
    - If his daughter’s co-wife then went and married a second brother who also has another wife, and this second brother then died without children, just as his daughter’s original co-wife is patur, so too is the co-wife’s new co-wife. This would be so even if there were 100 brothers and this pattern continued on.
  - How is it that if the arayos died the co-wives are mutar? If a person’s daughter or one of the other arayos were married to his brother who also had another wife, and his daughter died or was divorced before his brother died, and then his brother died without children, the co-wife is mutar to the first brother for yibum.
  - Any of these arayos who could have gone through the miun process but did not, and then her husband died without children, the surviving brother must do chalitzah to one of the co-wives, but may not do yibum.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** We learn this Halacha regarding all the arayos from the case of his wife’s sister. If so, why don’t we mention that case first? If you will try to answer that the Mishna went in order of severity of punishment, and the first group are punishable by death of burning, which according to **R’ Shimon** is the most severe of the punishments,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

then the case of his mother in law should be listed first, because the punishment of death by burning is actually written regarding the case of a mother in law, and learned out from there to the others to which it applies!? Also, after the case of his mother in law (and the others with a punishment of burning), it should then have listed the case of his daughter in law, since that case would be punishable by death of stoning, which is the second most severe form of death punishment!? **A:** The reason the case of his daughter is listed first is because it is learned out through a drasha, which causes it to be more dear to the Tanna of the Mishna.

- **Q:** The fact that all the arayos are patur and make their co-wives patur from yibum and chalitzah is all learned from a drasha, so why is the case of his daughter more dear to the Tanna? **A:** This Halacha of yibum for those arayos is learned via a drasha, but the underlying fact that the relationship causes her to be one of the arayos is explicitly stated in a pasuk. However, the fact that his daughter (out of wedlock) is considered to be an ervah is itself only learned via a drasha. That is why it is more dear to the Tanna and why it is listed first.

### -----Daf ל--3-----

- **Q:** Now that we explained, that arayos learned via a drasha are more dear to the Tanna, and are therefore listed first, why isn't the ervah of his sister's wife, which is taught clearly in a pasuk even with regard to the halachos of yibum, listed last? **A:** Since the Tanna listed the arayos that contain an aspect of sisters (a maternal sister, etc.) he listed the wife's sister at that point as well.
  - **Q:** Why wasn't that entire group listed at the end? **A:** The order of the Mishna is based on the closeness of the relationship to the person. The Mishna began with listing his daughter and granddaughters, because they are his own blood relatives. Once those are listed, the Tanna listed the parallel generations of his wife. Once he mentions that, he mentions the generation above his wife. The Tanna then lists his sister and his mother's sister, who are his blood relatives. Since he mentioned the arayos of sisters, he then mentioned the ervah of his wife's sister. Really, the ervah of his daughter in law should have been mentioned before the wife of his brother who died before he was born, which is not assur because of a blood relationship, but since the Tanna had begun listing arayos of siblings, it mentions that one next. After that, the Tanna finally listed the ervah of his daughter in law.
- **Q:** Why did the Mishna say that these women "patur" their co-wives from yibum? It seems more appropriate to say that these women make yibum "assur" for their co-wives!? **A:** If it would have said "assur" we would think that yibum is assur for them but chalitzah must be done.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna say that she makes her co-wives "assur for chalitzah"? **A:** The term "assur" is not really fitting for chalitzah, because going through the motions of chalitzah can't be said to be "assur".
  - **Q:** Why isn't it appropriate to say that chalitzah is assur? We should say that it is assur, because if it is allowed, it may lead people to think that yibum is mutar as well!? **A:** The Mishna uses the verbiage of "patur" to teach that it is only in this case of the mitzvah of yibum that a co-wife becomes assur. In any other situation, the co-wife of an ervah would remain mutar.
- **Q:** Why didn't the Mishna just say that they are patur from yibum, and we would know that chalitzah would not be needed either? Why does the Mishna have to specifically say that they are patur "from chalitzah and yibum"? **A:** We would have thought that even when yibum can't be done, chalitzah must still be done. The Mishna teaches that whoever is subject to yibum is subject to chalitzah, but whoever is not subject to yibum is not subject to chalitzah.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna mention yibum before chalitzah, or only mention chalitzah altogether? **A:** The Mishna follows **Abba Shaul**, who says that the mitzvah of chalitzah takes precedence over performing the mitzvah of yibum.
- **Q:** When a Tanna gives a number, it usually comes to exclude something. If so, when our Mishna mentions "15" in the beginning, what is it coming to exclude, and when it mentions "15" at the end, what is that coming to exclude? **A:** They come to exclude the halachos of **Rav** (that the co-wife of a sotah is patur) and **R' Assi** (that the co-wife of an ailunis is patur).
  - **Q:** According to **Rav** and **R' Assi**, what do the numbers in the Mishna come to exclude? **A:** If they agree with each other, one number would exclude the co-wife of minor who did miyun to the yavam, and the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

other number would exclude the co-wife of one who remarried her first husband after having been divorced from him and marrying another man in the interim. If they don't hold of each other, then one number would exclude the Halacha of the other one, and the second would exclude one of these cases.

- **Q:** According to **Rav** and **R' Assi**, why doesn't the Mishna mention the cases that they stated? **A:** Those women don't patur the co-wives of their co-wives, and therefore couldn't be listed in the Mishna.
- **Q:** How do we know that these arayos, their co-wives, and the co-wives of the co-wives are all patur from yibum? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says "Isha ehl achosa lo sikach litzror ervasa aleha b'chayeha". This pasuk says "aleha" and the pasuk by yibum says "aleha". A gezeirah shava teaches that one may not marry his wife's sister (and from there we learn to every ervah) even in a yibum situation. The word "litzror" teaches that even her co-wife is patur as well. The fact that the pasuk says "litzror" instead of "latzur" teaches that the co-wives of the co-wives are patur as well.
  - The Braisa continues, that we learn out all other arayos from a wife's sister. Just like a wife's sister is an ervah, which carries the kares penalty for a meizid and a chatas for a shogeg, and is assur to the yavam, so too any ervah which carries the kares penalty for a meizid and a chatas for a shogeg, is assur to the yavam.
  - We learn that all their tzaros are assur from the same comparison to a wife's sister.
  - The Braisa says, from here the **Chachomim** said, that there are 15 women who patur their co-wives and the co-wives of their co-wives from chalitza and yibum, forever and ever.
  - The Braisa says, we would think to include the 6 more stringent arayos (arayos who are assur to the person and to all his paternal brothers) into this list as well. However, we say that we must compare it to the wife's sister. Just as the wife's sister is an ervah which carries the kares penalty for a meizid and a chatas for a shogeg, and is mutar to the other brothers, and is assur to the yavam, and her co-wife becomes assur to the yavam as well, so too any ervah which carries the kares penalty for a meizid and a chatas for a shogeg, and is mutar to the other brothers is assur to the yavam, and her co-wives become assur as well. This excludes these 6 arayos, who are never mutar to the other brothers, and therefore these arayos are assur for yibum, but their co-wives remain mutar.
  - The Braisa ends off, that the punishment for one who takes one of the 15 women or their co-wives as a yevama is learned from the pasuk of "ki kol asher yaaseh mikol hato'eivos..."

### -----Daf 7---4-----

- **Q:** The Gemara said that we learn from a gezeirah shava that one cannot do yibum with his wife's sister (or any of the arayos). However, we would know that one could not do yibum with his wife's sister based on the fact that yibum is a mitzvas assei and the ervah is a mitzvas lo saasei which carries a kares penalty, and the rule is that an assei overrides a simple lo saasei, but not one that carries the kares penalty!
  - The Gemara now goes off on a tangent to explain how we know that an assei overrides a typical lo saasei, but does not override a lo saasei that carries the kares penalty.
  - We learn that an assei overrides a lo saasei from the pasuk regarding tzitzis, which is written right next to the pasuk of shaatnez, to teach that the assei of tzitzis overrides the lo saasei of shaatnez. We find that we darshen pesukim in this way – that when the Torah puts them next to each other, it does so to teach something. In fact, even the shitos (including **R' Yehuda**) who say that we generally don't darshen in this way, would agree that we do darshen this way for pesukim in Chumash Devarim (which is where the pasuk of shaatnez and tzitzis are written). We find clear instances where **R' Yehuda** refused to darshen pesukim in this way (regarding darshening the pesukim to teach that one who practices kishuf is put to death by stoning), but did darshen pesukim in this way when the pesukim were in Chumash Devarim (to teach that one may not marry the woman who was raped or seduced by his father).
    - **Q:** Why is Chumash Devarim treated differently in this way? **A:** Either because the placement of the pesukim (not in the place where you would expect them to be) makes it evident that it should be darshened (with regard to tzitzis, the pasuk should have been stated in the parsha of tzitzis). Or, because the pesukim seem to be extra, and are therefore available for this drasha.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The pasuk of shaatnez is extra, because a pasuk already says “Ubegeg kilayim shaatnez lo yaaleh alecha”, so the pasuk of “Lo silbash shaatnez” is therefore extra.

- **Q:** These pesukim are not extra, because if only the first pasuk (“lo yaaleh alecha”) was stated, we would think that even putting on clothing of shaatnez as a salesperson would be assur. The pasuk of “lo silbash” teaches that only wearing it to have hana’ah from it is assur. And, if only the pasuk of “lo silbash” was stated, we would think it is only assur when formally wearing shaatnez, but not assur to simply cover oneself with shaatnez. Therefore both pesukim are needed!? **A:** The words “wool and linen” are extra, because **R’ Yishmael** has taught that whenever the Torah says “begeg” it means a garment of wool or linen. Therefore, there is no reason for the pasuk to specify that the begeg must be of wool and linen.
- **Q:** The words wool and linen are needed, because we would think that when covering oneself with shaatnez, since there is little hana’ah, it must be made of wool and linen to be assur, but when *wearing* clothing, any mixture would be assur!? **A:** We could have learned it out from a gezeirah shava on the word “shaatnez”.
- **Q:** According to **R’ Yishmael** we should learn that tzitzis overrides shaatnez from the fact that the Torah says to put “techeiles”, which is wool, on the corners of “bigdeihem”, which he says means wool or linen. If so, we have a clear pasuk that teaches that shaatnez is overridden by tzitzis, so why do we need the extra words of “wool and linen”!? **A:** If we only had this pasuk as the source, we would think, like **Rava** darshened, that wool tzitzis should be used for wool clothing, and linen tzitzis for linen clothing (based on the pasuk of “hakanaf”, which suggests the tzitzis should be made from the same material as the corner itself), but would not know that shaatnez is allowed. That is why we need the source of the pasuk of tzitzis being written right next to the pasuk of shaatnez, and the extra words of “wool and linen” to tell us to darshen in this way to teach that shaatnez is allowed for the mitzvah of tzitzis.