



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

### Yevamos Daf Kuf Yud Daled

- **R' Yitzchak bar Bisna** once lost the keys to the Beis Medrash in the reshus harabim on Shabbos. **R' Pedas** told him, bring children to that area. They will play there, and when they find the keys they will bring it to you.
  - We see that he held that one need not stop a minor from doing an aveirah.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that a Braisa is a proof to this. A Braisa says that a person may not tell a minor to do an aveirah, but he need not stop a minor from ripping out plants on Shabbos or throwing things (into a reshus harabim) on Shabbos? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa may be discussing where he was ripping plants out of a non-perforated flower pot (the plants are not attached to the ground and therefore assur to rip only D'Rabanan), and throwing things into a karmelis (which is only assur D'Rabanan). However, it may be that we would have to stop a minor from doing a D'Oraisa aveirah.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a goy comes on Shabbos to extinguish a fire in a Jew's house, we may not ask him to extinguish it, but we need not stop him from doing so. If a minor comes to do so, we must tell him not to do it. This refutes **R' Pedas!**? **A: R' Yochanan** said, that is because the minor is doing so because he knows his father wants him to do it. However, if he is doing something on his own will, we need not stop him. Although we would also have to stop a goy who does it because he knows the Jew wants him to, a goy only does something for his own benefit (a reward) and therefore we need not think that it was done for the Jew.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if the son of a chaver had fruit from his grandfather who is an ahm haaretz, the father need not prevent him from eating it (even though the chaver himself could not eat it without first separating maaser). This is a proof to **R' Pedas!** **A: R' Yochanan** said, it may be that the **Rabanan** were lenient regarding demai.
    - **Q:** This suggests that if it wasn't demai **R' Yochanan** would say that we must stop the child from eating it. How can that jive with **R' Yochanan** from before, where he said that a child who acts on his own does not need to be stopped? **A: R' Yochanan** was unsure whether we must stop a child from doing an aveirah. Therefore, he refutes proofs from either side.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the son of a chaver Kohen got terumah from his grandfather who is an ahm haaretz, the father need not prevent the child from eating the terumah, even though it may be tamei terumah, which is assur to eat. This is a proof to **R' Pedas!** **A:** The Braisa may be discussing terumah D'Rabanan, and we said there is only a need to stop a child from doing an aveirah D'Oraisa.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that we do not stop an infant from nursing from a goy or tamei animal. This is a proof to **R' Pedas!** **A:** That is because the infant would be in danger if he did not have a milk supply.
    - **Q:** If so, why does the Braisa say that an older child may not do so? **A:** The Braisa just means that for an older child we must first determine that there is a danger to him before we allow him to do so. An infant is presumed to be in danger without a milk supply.
    - **Q:** The Braisa said that **Abba Shaul** said that in practice they allowed infants to nurse from kosher animals on Yom Tov. What is the case? If there is danger for the child, then it should even be mutar on Shabbos, and if there is no danger it should even be assur on Yom Tov!? **A:** The case is where the child is in pain, but not in danger. Nursing is considered an unusual form of "mefarek". Therefore, on Shabbos when the issur carries a sekila penalty, the **Rabanan** are goizer and

do not allow it. On Yom Tov, when it is only a lav, the **Rabanan** were not goizer, and allowed it.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “lo sochlum ki sheketz heim” teaches that an adult must not allow a child to eat these assur things. This refutes **R’ Pedas!**? **A:** This only teaches that an adult may not give it to a child with his hands to eat. However, an adult need not prevent a child from eating them.
- **Q:** A Braisa learns a similar drasha regarding the eating of blood, from the pasuk of “kol nefesh mikem lo sochal dam”!? **A:** The Gemara give the same answer as it gave regarding shekatzim.
- **Q:** A Braisa learns a similar drasha regarding a Kohen becoming tamei. **A:** Again the Gemara answers in the same way.
  - All these 3 are necessary, because the shekatzim are assur in the most minute amount whereas blood is not. On the other hand, blood carries a kares penalty whereas shekatzim does not. These two apply to all Jews, whereas tumah only applies to Kohanim. Finally, tumah may have more reason to be assur because Kohanim have many extra mitzvos.
- **Q:** Our Mishna said that when the husband of a healthy woman dies without children and she falls to a deaf-mute brother who is married to the yevama’s sister, he must divorce his wife, because the yevama has a D’Oraisa zikah and he therefore can’t stay married to her sister. We see that we don’t allow a minor (or the similar case of a deaf-mute) to do an aveirah!? **A:** The reason they must divorce is because the wife is not a deaf-mute, and the divorce is therefore done to prevent her from an aveirah.
- **Q:** Our Mishna gives the similar case where the wife of the yavam was a deaf-mute, and still they must get divorced!? **A:** That case had the yavam as a healthy man. The divorce must be done to prevent him from doing an aveirah.
- **Q:** **Rava** asked, our Mishna says that where the yavam and his wife were both deaf-mute, and her sister fell to him for yibum, he must divorce his wife. We see that we don’t allow them to do an aveirah!? **A:** **R’ Shmaya** said, the reason there is that the **Rabanan** were goizer that they get divorced so that people not think that the yevama was released to remarry based on a D’Rabanan marriage treating her as an ervah.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHEIREISH SHENASSA!!!

### PEREK HA’ISHA SHALOM -- PEREK CHAMISHA ASSAR

#### MISHNA

- If a woman and her husband traveled overseas, and they were living peacefully (they were not fighting) and the world was at peace (they were not in a place of war), and she comes and says that her husband has died, she is believed and may remarry. If he didn’t have children, she is allowed to do yibum.
  - If there was marital harmony but the world was at war, or if there was no war but there was no marital harmony, and she comes back and says her husband has died, she is not believed.
  - **R’ Yehuda** says, a woman is never believed unless she returns crying with torn clothing. The **Rabanan** said to him, she is believed whether or not she has these signs of mourning.

#### GEMARA

- The Gemara says, the case in the Mishna of where there is marital peace and peace in the world does not mean that those circumstances have to be established. It was said to conform with the next part of the Mishna that discusses where there was no peace.
- **Rava** explained, the reason she is not believed during times of war is because we say that she didn’t actually see her husband dead, but rather assumes that he had died.
  - **Rava** thought to say that a time of famine is not like wartime, and a woman would not say her husband died unless she actually saw him dead. **Rava** then retracted this ruling based on a story that happened where a woman told **Rava** that her husband died in a

famine, and **Rava** was able to determine that she assumed that he must be dead, based on the amount of food he had, but never actually saw him dead. Based on this **Rava** said that famine is worse than war. During war she is still believed to say that I saw him dead in his bed. During famine she is only believed if she says she saw him dead and buried.

- The case of a collapsed building is like a case of wartime, because she assumes that he is dead. The same is true when she says so based on a snake and scorpion attack. With regard to a plague, some say it is like wartime, because she assumes death, and others say it is not like wartime, because she believes that if it is not his destined time to die, he will not, and she therefore will not assume him dead.