



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

Yevamos Daf Mem Vuv

- **R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** says, if one buys a slave from a goy, and before being toivel with intent to become slave, he goes and is toivel with intent for a full conversion, the slave acquires himself as a free man. This is so because the goy never owned the actual slave, he only owned the right to his work. Therefore, that is all the goy sold to the Yid. If the slave decides to convert before becoming the slave of the Yid, he can thereby acquire himself and become a free man.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, we have learned that when Balurya converted, her slaves went to the mikvah before she did (for her conversion), and they thereby became free. This suggests that the only reason they went out free was because she was not yet Jewish when her slaves were toivel, and if they would have done so after she was toivel, their tevila would not have set them free!? **A: Rava** said, what is meant is, that before her conversion, if they go to the mikvah even without any specific intent, they go free. After her conversion, if they go to the mikvah with intent to convert, only then would they go out free.
 - **R' Avya** said, it is only a goy who cannot own the body of another goy or of a Yid. However, a Yid can own the body of a goy.
 - **Shmuel** said, in order to be toivel a goy to become a slave (and not for full conversion), the owner must show his ownership (e.g. by using him for work) during the tevila. We find that **Ravina and R' Acha the son of Rava** put a leash around the neck of a slave as he was being toivel, to show that he is a slave. Also, as he raised his head from the water, they put a bucket of cement on his head and instructed him to carry it somewhere.
- **R' Pappa** said to **Rava**, we see that the people of the house of Pappa bar Abba would pay the tax obligation for people and then enslave those people. Is this enslaving a servitude to the extent that the people would need a "get shichrur" (a bill of emancipation) to go free? **Rava** said, **R' Sheishes** said that all people are considered as enslaved to the king, and the king says that whoever pays the tax of another becomes the master of the one who is paid for. Therefore, it is a true enslavement and a get shichrur would be needed.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba** was in Gavla and saw that Jewish girls were pregnant from men who had gotten a bris but had not yet gone to the mikvah for geirus. He also saw that non-Jews would dilute the wine for the Yidden to drink. He also saw that non-Jews would cook the beans for the Yidden to eat. He didn't say anything to these people. He later told **R' Yochanan** about these matters, and **R' Yochanan** told him to announce that these children are mamzeirem (**R' Yochanan** holds that the geirus is not complete until there is tevila and a bris, and as such the children are from a goy and a Jewess, which he holds are mamzeirem), that this wine is assur as yayin nesech (although the goy may not have touched the wine, we must be goizer and say this is assur because the force of his pouring has moved the wine), and that the beans are assur as bishul akum (we must be goizer since these people are not bnei Torah).
 - **Q: Is this to say that if they were Bnei Torah the beans would be mutar? R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak in the name of Rav** said, anything that cannot be eaten raw and is cooked by a goy becomes assur as bishul akum!? **A: R' Yochanan** holds like another version of **Rav**, in which he says, if something is not significant enough to be served to kings, it does not become assur if cooked by a goy.
- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says, if a ger had a bris but did not go to the mikvah, he is a full ger, since we find that the Yidden who left Mitzrayim gave themselves a bris but did not go to the

mikvah. **R' Yehoshua** says, if a ger went to the mikvah but did not yet have a bris, he is a full ger, since we find that the women who left Mitzrayim went to a mikvah and did not have a bris. The **Chachomim** say that a geirus is not complete until he has gotten a bris and has gone to the mikvah.

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Eliezer** learn from the women who left Mitzrayim that a tevila alone is enough? The fact that women are not physically capable of having a bris would not prevent **R' Eliezer** from learning from there, because we find that **R' Eliezer** learns out things even from such situations!? **A:** It must be that **R' Eliezer** agrees that a tevila alone is enough for geirus. He only argues whether a bris alone would suffice as well, and learns from the men who left Mitzrayim that a bris alone is enough. **R' Yehoshua** says, the men who left Mitzrayim also went to the mikvah, and there is therefore no proof that a bris alone would suffice.
 - **R' Yehoshua** learns that the men went to the mikvah from the pasuk that says that Moshe Rabbeinu sprinkled the blood of the korbanos and sprinkled it on the people. We have a tradition that sprinkling is always accompanied by a tevila. **R' Yehoshua** says based on logic, that the women went to the mikvah – they had to have done something to become full-fledged Jews. It must be this something was a tevila.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, a geirus is not complete until a bris and tevila have been done.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious since this is the shita of the **Chachomim**, who are the majority opinion!? **A:** We find in another Braisa that the shita is actually the singular view of **R' Yose**. Therefore, **R' Yochanan** is telling us that we pasken like him.
 - **Q:** This Braisa says, that according to **R' Yehuda**, if a person comes and says that he has gotten a bris but has not yet been toivel, we believe him and allow him to go to the mikvah, and “therefore” one may even toivel a ger on Shabbos. Once we know that he says that the bris alone is sufficient, it seems obvious that the tevila may be done on Shabbos, so why does the Braisa say “therefore the tevila may be done on Shabbos”? **A:** We would think that **R' Yehuda** actually holds that only mikvah alone is sufficient, which is why we don't require proof of his getting a bris for geirus. If so, we would say that he would not allow the tevila on Shabbos since that “repairs” the person. The Braisa therefore teaches that **R' Yehuda** says that either one alone suffices.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that **R' Yose** does not allow the tevila on Shabbos. Since **R' Yose** requires both for the geirus, it is obvious that the tevila cannot be done on Shabbos!? **A:** We would think that **R' Yose** holds that the bris alone is sufficient, but only in this case it is not, because it was not done in front of us. The Braisa therefore teaches that **R' Yose** always says that neither one alone is sufficient.
 - **Rabbah** said, a story once happened by **R' Chiya Beribi**, where a person had a bris but had not gone to the mikvah for geirus and they told the person, wait here until tomorrow and then go to the mikvah. We learn 3 things from here: 1) that a geirus must take place in front of a Beis Din of 3 people; 2) the geirus is not complete until he has gotten a bris and gone to the mikvah; 3) a ger cannot go to the mikvah at night.
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, conversion must be done in front of a Beis Din of 3, since the pasuk uses the word “mishpat” in reference to him, and “mishpat” requires 3 people.