



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

Yevamos Daf Yud Aleph

- **R' Ashi** said that the first part of the Braisa quoted previously (that said that if one brother did chalitza, then married the woman, then died without children, the other brothers must do chalitzah) can be answered according to the shita of **Reish Lakish** by following the view of **R' Shimon**, and the Braisa is referring to a brother who was born after the brother did the chalitza and after he married her, which is why this new brother is mutar to her and must do chalitza. When the Braisa then says that if one of the brothers who was born before the chalitza married the yevama after the chalitza was done, the marriage is ineffective, that follows **Reish Lakish** that after chalitza the woman is assur to the other brothers with a kares penalty. **Ravina** said, the first part of the Braisa means that a chalitza would be needed by any of the brothers, and this follows **R' Yochanan** who says that the woman is only assur to them with a lav, and that is why a chalitza is needed. The later part of the Braisa (that said that if after the above scenario, one of the brothers gave her kiddushin, she does not need a divorce from him) can be answered according to the shita of **R' Yochanan** by following the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Shimon**, and the later part of the Braisa is referring to where a brother who was born after the chalitza went and married her. According to the **Rabanan**, that would carry the kares penalty and would therefore not be an effective marriage.
 - It was taught, **R' Acha** and **Ravina** argue, in a case where a brother did yibum, and then another brother went ahead and was "boel" one of the tzaros of the woman who got chalitza, one says he would be chayuv kares and one says he has only transgressed an assei. The one who says he gets kares follows **Reish Lakish**, and the one who says he only transgressed an assei follows **R' Yochanan**.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that the tzara of a woman who was mezaneh while married to her husband, is patur from yibum. The reason is that the pasuk refers to such a woman with the term "tumah", which is the same term used when describing arayos.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, **R' Shimon** says in a Mishna that a woman who got remarried based on witness testimony that her husband had died, when in fact he was alive (in which case she is treated like a woman who was mezaneh), and her first husband died without children, if she gets yibum or chalitza, her tzaros become patur. We see that the tzara of a woman who was mezaneh is chayuv in yibum or chalitza!? **A: Rav** would say, "I made a statement regarding a woman who was truly mezaneh D'Oraisa, and you ask me from a case where she is only considered to have been mezaneh D'Rabanan (because D'Oraisa she was allowed to believe the testimony of the witnesses)"!
 - **R' Chisda** felt, that any Rabbinic enactment is made to mimic the case of a D'Oraisa, and would therefore be treated in the same way.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, a Mishna says that a woman who secluded with a man (but no witnesses saw the zenus) needs chalitzah!? **A: Rav** would say, "I was talking about a woman who was proven to have been mezaneh, and you are asking me from a case where she was uncertain to have been mezaneh!"
 - **Q:** We find in a Braisa that discusses the prohibition to remarry one's divorcee if she had married someone else after the divorce, that the word "tumah" is even used to describe a woman who secluded with another man, without testimony of zenus. Based on this, she should be treated like a woman who is known to have been mezaneh!? **A:** The Braisa actually refers to a woman who was mezaneh (not just secluded), and the Braisa says that she only secluded, because it wanted to use a more refined expression.

