



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

Yevamos Daf Nun Vuv

ECHAD HAME'AREH V'ECHAD HAGOMER KANAH

- **Q:** To what extent is this less than ideal bi'ah koneh the yevama? **A: Rav** says it is fully koneh (to the point that if he is a Kohen she may eat terumah even though a full bi'ah was not done). **Shmuel** says he is only koneh her for the things written in the pasuk – to inherit his brother's estate, and to free her from yibum.
 - The Gemara says, all agree that if she was widowed as a nesuah, this inferior bi'ah allows her to continue eating terumah (since she was allowed to eat terumah before her husband died). The machlokes is where she was widowed as an arusah (and was not allowed to eat on the basis of her husband before he died): **Rav** says, the inferior bi'ah (e.g. shogeg, etc.) is treated by the pasuk as a full bi'ah and she may therefore now eat terumah. **Shmuel** says that an inferior bi'ah is only good enough for the yevam to step into the place of the first husband – just like she couldn't eat terumah under him, she also can't eat terumah under the yavam. The view of **Shmuel** is consistent with his view stated elsewhere.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Kohen gives kiddushin to a woman, and he then becomes a deaf-mute before the nisuin, she may not eat terumah even after the nisuin. If he then dies and she falls to yibum to a brother who is also a deaf-mute, if he does yibum (his bi'ah is on the same level as the deficient bi'ahs listed in our Mishna) she may then eat terumah. In this way the yavam is stronger than the husband. Now, according to **Rav**, this makes sense. However, this is difficult according to **Shmuel**!? **A: Shmuel** will say, the Braisa should be read as saying, if the first husband became a deaf-mute *after* the nisuin, and then died, causing his wife to fall to a deaf-mute brother, the yibum of the brother will again allow her to eat terumah.
 - Others say, if she was widowed as an arusah, all agree that the inferior bi'ah does not allow her to eat terumah, just as she couldn't eat terumah before her husband died. The machlokes is where she was widowed as a nesuah. **Rav** says, since she ate terumah under her husband she may eat terumah based on the inferior bi'ah as well, and **Shmuel** says that the inferior bi'ah only accomplishes the things listed in the pasuk.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** said in the name of **Shmuel**, that wherever the husband allowed her to eat terumah the yavam also allows her to eat terumah (even with an inferior bi'ah)!? **A: Shmuel** meant that any type of bi'ah that would have allowed her to eat terumah under her husband will also allow her to eat terumah under her yavam.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks the question from the same Braisa as before. The Gemara says that this remains a kashyeh.
 - A Braisa says, if a Kohen gave kiddushin to a woman and became a deaf-mute before the nisuin, she may not eat terumah on account of him even after the nisuin. If she has a child from him, she may then eat terumah. If the child dies, **R' Nosson** says she may continue eating terumah and the **Chachomim** say that she may not.
 - **Rabbah** explained, the reason for **R' Nosson's** view is that she ate previously, and therefore may continue eating.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, when a Yisraelis marries a Kohen who dies without children she must stop eating terumah even though she had previously eaten on account of him. The same should be if this child were to die!? **A: R' Yosef** said, the reason

for **R' Nosson** is that he holds that the nisuin of a deaf-mute allows the woman to eat terumah, and we are not goizer the nisuin for the case of the kiddushin.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, if that is the reason, then why does the Braisa only allow her to eat when a child is born? **A:** That case was said, because it is only in that case that the **Rabanan** agree and allow her to eat terumah.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Nosson** argue in the beginning of the Braisa as well? **A:** He waited for the **Rabanan** to complete their view, and then he argued.
 - **Q:** If so, the Braisa should first state the view of the **Rabanan** (if the child dies she may no longer eat terumah) and then afterward state the view of **R' Nosson**!? **Kashyeh.**

V'CHEIN HABAH AHL ACHAS MIKOL HA'ARAYOS

- **R' Amram** said that **R' Sheishes** told them, that the wife of a Yisrael who is raped, although she remains mutar to him, she is forever assur to marry a Kohen. **R' Sheishes** said that we see this from our Mishna which says "and also", presumably meaning that if one is mezaneh with an ervah in one of the ways listed in the Mishna (e.g. if a married woman is raped), and the Mishna then says that she is passul to a Kohen. The Gemara says, the Mishna is no proof, because the "and also" in the Mishna may be referring to the Halacha of hara'a.
 - **Q:** Does that mean to say that we learn out hara'a by arayos from yevama? We have learned that we actually learn hara'a by yevama from arayos!? **A:** The "and also" must refer to bi'ah in the unnatural way.
 - **Q:** That is also learned by yevama from arayos, and not the other way around!? **A:** The "and also" must be referring to the Halacha of unnatural bi'ah done to chayvei lavim.
 - **Rabbah** said, if a Kohen lives with his wife after she is raped, he would be chayuv malkus for living with a zonah in addition to malkus for the issur of "tumah".
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, a Braisa says that the issur for a Kohen to live with his wife who was raped is learned from the assei of a sotah. If so, the issur is considered to be an assei, and one doesn't receive malkus for violating an assei!? **A: Rabbah** said, she is really assur with the lav of a zonah. The pasuk of sotah only teaches that the wife of a Yisrael is not assur if she was raped. However, it leaves the wife of a Kohen in the status of the lav of zonah.
 - **Other say** that **Rabbah** said, a Kohen who lived with his wife who was raped gets malkus for the lav of "tumah". This suggests that **Rabbah** would say that he does not get malkus for the lav of zonah.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, a Braisa says that the wife of a Kohen who was raped is assur to live with him, and this is learned from the assei of sotah. If so, how can **Rabbah** say that he gets malkus for living with her? **A: Rabbah** said, she is really assur with the lav of tumah. The pasuk of sotah only teaches that the wife of a Yisrael is not assur if she was raped. However, it leaves the wife of a Kohen in the status of the lav of tumah.

MISHNA

- A widow who is now an arusah to a Kohen Gadol, or a divorcee or chalutza who is now an arusah to a regular Kohen may not eat terumah (even at a time when other arusos of a Kohen would be allowed to eat terumah). **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say that they may eat terumah.
- If these women are widowed or divorced after the nisuin takes place, they are passul from Kehuna and terumah. If they are widowed or divorced before the nisuin, they remain mutar for Kehuna and/or terumah.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** said we can say a kal v'chomer, if the permissible kiddushin of a Yisrael to a divorced daughter of a Kohen stops her from eating terumah, then surely the prohibited kedushin of these women to a Kohen should surely prevent them from eating terumah! They

said to **R' Meir**, it may be that since the Yisrael can never bring a woman to eat terumah, that is why his kiddushin prevents her from eating terumah. However, since a Kohen in a permitted scenario can bring a woman to eat terumah, it may be that he allows her to eat terumah in this case as well, as long as the forbidden nissuin did not yet take place.