



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

### Yevamos Daf Chuf Aleph

- Regarding the bi'ah of a Kohen Gadol to a widow in yibum, there is a machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **R' Elazar**: one says that it does not exempt her tzara (i.e. the bi'ah did not accomplish yibum), and the other says that it does exempt her tzara.
  - In the case where the widow was widowed from nisuin, all would agree that the tzara would not become exempt, because the assei of yibum could not override the assei and lo saasei, and the yibum would therefore be ineffective. The machlokes is when the widow was widowed from eirusin. The view that the tzara is patur is because the yibum overrides the lo saasei. The view that the tzara is not patur holds that the assei does not override the lo saasei, because there is a way to do the mitzvah (i.e. with chalitza) without having to override the assei.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a man is bo'el his yevama who is assur to him with a lo assei, he is koneh her!? This refutes the second view!? **TEYUFTA.**
    - **Q:** Should we say that this also refutes **Reish Lakish**, who says that an assei does not override a lo saasei when there is another way to do the mitzvah!? **A:** He would say that doing chalitza instead of yibum is not considered another way of doing the mitzvah.
- **Rava** said, there is a "remez" to secondary arayos in the pasuk that talks about arayos, which uses the word "ha'el", which is a strong word, which means that there is also a weaker form of arayos. **R' Yehuda** said, we see it in a pasuk that teaches that Shlomo instituted safeguards to prevent one from violating the Torah. One of those safeguards was secondary arayos. **R' Oshaya** said, we see it in a pasuk that instructs us to enlarge the Torah, by adding safeguards. **R' Kahana** said, we see it from the pasuk of "Ushmartem es mishmarti", which teaches that we should make safeguards. Although this seems to teach that secondary arayos are D'Oraisa (it is a pasuk in the Torah), the pasuk is only an asmachta.
- A Braisa lists the secondary arayos: a maternal grandmother, a paternal grandmother, paternal grandfather's wife, maternal grandfather's wife, the wife of a father's maternal brother, the wife of a mother's paternal brother, a son's daughter in law, and a daughter's daughter in law. The following are not secondary arayos: a father in law's wife, the wife of a step son, (although one is assur with the daughter of his step son), a step son is mutar with his step father's wife and his step father's daughter. This results in that a step son's wife can tell the step father "I am mutar to you, but my daughter is assur to you".
  - **Q:** A step child's daughter is assur D'Oraisa, so why is it listed in this Braisa!? **A:** The Braisa wanted to write the statement that the step daughter in law can make, and therefore introduced it with saying that the step granddaughter is assur.
    - **Q:** If the Braisa wanted to show that statement to show the dichotomy of the case, it should have also said that that same statement can be made by the wife of one's father in law to the son in law (she is mutar to him, but her daughter is the son in law's wife's half sister, and is therefore assur)!? **A:** This case is not absolute, because a wife's sister at times is mutar.
- **Rav** said, 4 of the secondary arayos are limited to the relation stated, and do not apply to any earlier or later generations. **Rav** knew 3 of them: the wife of a mother's paternal brother, the wife of a father's maternal brother, and a daughter in law. **Zeiri** added the wife of a maternal grandfather.

- **Rav** did not include **Zeiri's** case, because he held that the case can be confused with a paternal grandfather's wife, which is assur. **Zeiri** held that people don't often see their maternal family, so there is no reason to be further goizer.
- **Q:** The case of a daughter in law is assur D'Oraisa!? **A: Rav** meant to say one's son's daughter in law.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that this ervah would continue down the generations!? **Rav** was referring to one's daughter's daughter in law. The Braisa is referring to one's son's daughter in law.
- **Q:** They asked, is the wife of a mother's maternal brother a secondary ervah? Maybe she is not, because there is no paternal element in the relationship at all and so the **Rabanan** were not goizer, or maybe they were? **A: R' Safra** said, the wife of a mother's paternal brother is a gezeirah, so we could not add a gezeirah on top of that.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, many of the secondary arayos are gezeiros on top of gezeiros, and yet the **Rabanan** were goizer!?
    - **Q:** Based on this, are we goizer in the case of the mother's maternal brother or not? **A:** We have learned that **R' Yehuda bar Shila** said, whenever a female is an ervah, the wife of the corresponding male relationship will be assur as well. Now, we know this is not always the case, for example although one's mother in law is an ervah, the wife of his father in law is not. **R' Yehuda** must have been referring to the case in our question, and he is saying that since a mother's maternal sister is assur, so too is the wife of a mother's maternal brother. We see that she is assur. The reason why this case is different is because there is only one marriage in the relationship, whereas the others (as in the example given) have 2 marriages (the son in law married the daughter, and the father in law then married his wife).
- **Q: R' Mesharshiya of Tusniya** asked **R' Pappi**, what is the status of one's father's father's brother's wife and of his father's father's sister? Are they secondary arayos? Do we say that since the generation under them are real arayos, the **Rabanan** made them into secondary arayos, or do we say that they did not? **A:** The Braisa that listed the secondary arayos did not list these, so they must not be!
  - It may be that they were left out because we find that other secondary arayos were left out – like the secondary arayos of **R' Chiya**, but the fact that they were left out is not meant to exclude them from being assur.
  - **Ameimar** said that these 2 cases of the question are not secondary arayos.
    - **R' Hillel** asked **R' Ashi**, I once saw the list of secondary arayos according to **Mar the son of Rabana**, and there were 16. Presumably, they were the 8 of the previous Braisa, the 6 of **R' Chiya**, and these 2, which would mean they are assur!? **R' Ashi** said, according to that, there should be 17, because we have previously said that the wife of a mother's maternal brother is also assur! **R' Hillel** said, the 2 cases of our question are similar and are therefore considered as one. **R' Ashi** told him, if you saw that the list said that these women are mutar, you would have not trusted the list as coming from **Mar the son of Rabana**, since he was not signed on it. Now too, we cannot trust this list, and it therefore does not prove that these 2 women are considered to be secondary arayos.