



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

Yevamos Daf Nun Hey

- A Mishna says, if a man is told that his wife (Wife 1) has died, and he therefore goes and marries her paternal sister (Wife 2). He is then told that she died and he went and married Wife 2's maternal sister (Wife 3). He is then told that Wife 3 died, so he went and married Wife 3's paternal sister (Wife 4). He is then told that she died and he went and married Wife 4's maternal sister (Wife 5). If he then finds out that none of them had actually died, he is allowed to remain married to Wife 1, 3, and 5 (they are unrelated to each other) but not to Wife 2 and 4 (2 is a sister of 1, and 4 is a sister of 3). If only Wife 1 had actually died, he remains mutar to Wife 2 and 4, but not to Wife 3 and 5.
 - **Q:** We see from here that achos ishto is assur whether she is a paternal or a maternal sister. How do we know that? **A:** We learn it from the ervah of a sister. Just like a sister is assur whether she is a paternal or maternal sister, the same is with a wife's sister.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should learn it from a father's brother's wife, and just like that is only assur for a paternal brother, a wife's sister should only be assur when she is a paternal sister!? **A:** It makes more sense to learn it from a sister, since a sister and a wife's sister are both considered to be his own relatives, as opposed to the relative of his father.
 - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to learn it from the case of the aunt, since the aunt and the wife's sister are both arayos brought about through a marriage!? **A:** We learn it out from eishes ach, which is also his own relative and comes about through marriage.
 - **Q:** How do we know that eishes ach is assur whether the brother is a paternal or maternal brother? **A:** A Braisa says we learn it out from the pasuk that says "ervas eishes achicha lo sigaleh" and then ends off with "ervas achicha hee". Those extra words teach that it applies to a paternal and maternal brother.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, maybe the extra words are only to be used to assur the wife of a paternal brother, and the extra words are needed to teach a case where the brother died with children? **A:** There is another extra phrase of "ervas achicha gila", which teaches that she is assur in that case as well. Therefore, the earlier words can be used to teach that even a maternal brother's wife is assur.
 - **Q:** If the maternal and paternal brothers are treated the same, maybe we should say that the Halacha of yibum applies to a maternal brother as well? **A:** The pasuk which teaches that a maternal brother's wife is assur says "hee", which teaches that she remains assur forever, without an opportunity for yibum.
 - **Q:** We have learned that all arayos are compared to each other and are therefore learned out from each other. If so, why does the pasuk write the chiyuv of kares by the ervah of a sister? **A:** It is needed for the drasha of **R' Yochanan**, who says that if one had bi'ah with multiple arayos in one period of forgetfulness, he is chayuv a separate chatas for each and every ervah. According to **R' Yitzchak**, who uses this for another drasha, he will learn it out from the extra word of "isha" written in the pasuk of nidah.
 - **Q:** Why does the pasuk write the chiyuv of "aririm yihiyu" (kares) in the pasuk of the ervah of a father's brother's wife? **A:** It is needed for the drasha of **Rabbah**, who says, there is another pasuk that says "aririm yamusu". We need both these pesukim to teach, that if he has children

at the time he did the aveirah or born after that time, they will die in his lifetime, and if he doesn't have children, he will die childless.

- **Q:** How do we know that hara'a is assur by relationships of chayvei lavim as well? **A:** Since the pasuk regarding one who has bi'ah with a shifcha charufah says "shichvas zera" (which refers to a full bi'ah), it must be that all regular chayvei lavim are assur even with hara'a.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that since the Torah taught that chayvei kares are assur with hara'a, it must be that chayvei lavim are assur only with a full bi'ah!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, if that was true, the pasuk regarding shifcha charufa would not have to tell us that she is assur only with a full bi'ah.
- **Q:** How do we know that the chayvei lavim to a Kohen are assur even with hara'a? **A:** We learn it from the chayvei kares with a gezeirah shava.
- **Q:** How do we know that women assur only with an assei are assur even with hara'a? **A:** We learn it from the chayvei lavim with a gezeirah shava.
- **Q:** How do we know that a yevama is assur even with hara'a to an outsider before yibum or chalitzah is done to her? **A:** According to the view that she is assur to an outsider with a lav, this would fall into the category of lavim. According to the view that she is assur with an assei, this would fall into the category of the chayvei assei.
- **Q:** How do we know that a yavam can be koneh a yevama with hara'a? **A:** We learn it from a gezeirah shava from chayvei lavim.
- **Q:** How do we know that any man can be koneh his wife with hara'a? **A:** We learn it from a gezeirah shava from chayvei kares.
- **Q: Rava** asked, why is it that the pesukim regarding shifcha charufa, eishes ish, and sotah, each mention "shichvas zera", which suggests that a complete bi'ah is necessary? **A:** Regarding shifcha charufa it teaches that one is not chayuv until there is a complete bi'ah. Regarding an eishes ish, it teaches that one is not chayuv if the bi'ah was done without kishuy eiver (which is therefore not capable of emitting zera). According to the shita that even such a person would be chayuv, we must say that it teaches that one would not be chayuv for bi'ah with the corpse of a married woman. Regarding a sotah, the pasuk says that to teach that one is not chayuv if the sotah was only warned regarding a man with whom there is suspicion that she engaged in bi'ah in an unnatural way.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the pasuk of "mishkivei isha" teaches that unnatural is equivalent to natural bi'ah in all circumstances!? **A: Rava** said, this teaches that a warning for a wife who is suspected of bodily contact with a man (but not actual bi'ah), does not make her into a sotah.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, that is obvious and would not need a pasuk. For although it is lewd behavior, it is not znus!? **A: Abaye** said, this teaches that a warning for a wife who is suspected of having her private area only touch the man's private area (but not actual bi'ah), does not make her into a sotah.
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to the view that hara'a is actual penetration of the man into the woman. However, according to the view that mere contact is hara'a, **Abaye** cannot be correct!? **A:** We must say like **Rava** said. With regard to **Abaye's** question, we would think that the Torah said a sotah is created based on the husband's objection to particular conduct, and therefore even suspected contact would be enough to make her assur as a sotah.
- **Shmuel** said, hara'a is the contact of a man's and woman's private areas, since it is impossible to have contact without the slightest penetration. We can see that **R' Yochanan** holds this way as well, because **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the "complete bi'ah" for shifcha charufa is the penetration of the top of the man's eiver. Now, if that is considered to be "complete bi'ah", it must be that hara'a is simple contact.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa says that "shifchas zera" teaches that he is only chayuv for a bi'ah where he can emit zera. Presumably this refers to a bi'ah of full penetration? **A:** It may refer to penetration of the top of the eiver, which is also considered to be enough to emit zera.

- **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that hara'a is the penetration of the top of the eiver. They asked **R' Dimi**, we have learned that **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said that **R' Yochanan** said differently!? **R' Dimi** said, either he is lying or I am lying (i.e. our two statements cannot be reconciled).
- **Ravin in the name of R' Yochanan** said that hara'a is the penetration of the top of the eiver. He clearly argues on **Rabbah bar bar Chana**. Must we say that he argues on **Shmuel** as well? **A:** It may be that from the point of contact until penetration of the top of the eiver is all considered to be hara'a.
- **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda in the name of R' Yochanan** said that hara'a is the penetration of the top of the eiver, and the completion of bi'ah refers to the actual end of the bi'ah. Anything less than this initial penetration (i.e. mere contact) is considered to be only contact, and they would be patur. This clearly argues on the view of **Shmuel**.