



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

Yevamos Daf Samach

- The Braisa said that if a Kohen Gadol marries a girl who was raped or seduced by another man, **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** said the child would be a chalal, and the **Chachomim** said the child would be valid.
 - **R' Huna in the name of Rav** and **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, the Halacha follows **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**.
 - **Another version** was that **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, the reason for the view of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** is that he follows **R' Elazar**, who says that an unmarried man and woman who are mezaneh give the woman the status of a zonah.
 - **Q:** How can he hold like **R' Elazar**, when we know that we always pasken like **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, and yet we find that we don't pasken like this Halacha of **R' Elazar**!? This remains a **KASHYEH**.
 - **R' Ashi** said, they argue whether the violation of an assei can cause a child to be a chalal: **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says that it does, and the **Chachomim** say that it does not.
- A Braisa says, if the sister of a Kohen is an arusah when she dies, **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** say the Kohen may become tamei for her. **R' Yose and R' Shimon** say that he may not. All would agree that if his sister was raped or seduced and then died, that the Kohen may not become tamei for her. **R' Shimon** said that if the sister had lost her besulim due to injury, the Kohen may not become tamei for her, because **R' Shimon** says only when the sister is still fit to marry a Kohen Gadol may her brother be metamei for her. All agree that a Kohen may be metamei for his sister who was a bogeres when she died.
 - **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** darshen the pasuk as follows: "v'laachoso habesulah" teaches that a Kohen may not become tamei for his sister who was raped or seduced. "Asher lo huysa l'ish" teaches that he may become tamei to a sister who lost her besulim due to injury. "Hakrova" comes to include an arusa, and "eilav" comes to include a bogeres, for although **R' Meir** says that the word "besula" includes even a bogeres, we would think to learn the meaning of besula from the pasuk where it is associated with a naara, and learn that here too she must be a naara.
 - **R' Yose and R' Shimon** say that "v'laachoso habesulah" teaches that a Kohen may not become tamei for his sister who was raped, seduced, or lost her besulim due to injury. "Asher lo huysa l'ish" comes to exclude an arusah. "Hakrova" comes to include an arusa who had divorced before she died, and "eilav" comes to include a bogeres.
 - **Q:** How could we say that **R' Shimon** allows him to become tamei for a sister who divorced as an arusah, when **R' Shimon** said that he can only become tamei for a sister who is fit to marry a Kohen Gadol? **A:** The pasuk specifically includes her in the pasuk of "krova".
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that the pasuk also includes a sister who lost her besulim due to injury? **A:** The pasuk can be used to include only one thing, and we will therefore leave the sister who lost her besulim out, since she has undergone a physical change.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yose** learn that he may become tamei for a sister who lost her besulim due to injury? He already used the pasuk for another drasha!? **A:** He says that "lo huysa" and "l'ish" can each be used for a separate drasha.
 - **Q:** How could **R' Shimon** say that "eilav" teaches to include a bogeres, when we have learned that he says that the word "besula" refers to one who has all her

besulim, which excludes a bogeres!? **A:** He actually learns his understanding of the word besula from here. He says that since the pasuk of “eilav” had to teach to include a bogeres, it must be that she would not otherwise be included in the word “besulah”.

- A Braisa says, **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** says that a girl who converted before her 3rd birthday is allowed to marry a Kohen. He bases this on a pasuk that seems to allow the Jewish soldiers to take the girl children of Midyan as wives even though Pinchas (the Kohen) was one of the soldiers. It must be that a girl who converts before her 3rd birthday is allowed to marry a Kohen.
 - The **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** say that the pasuk allows these girls to be taken as slaves, not wives.
 - **Q:** Why does **R’ Shimon** limit it to girls below 3? As long as we know she wasn’t mezaneh, we should allow a girl who converted older than 3 as well!? **A:** He learns it as **R’ Huna** learns it, from the fact that these pesukim seem to contradict each other and are answered by saying that a girl who is fit for bi’ah (above 3 years) is treated differently than a girl who is not yet fit for bi’ah (less than 3 years old). A Braisa says this way as well.
 - **Q:** How did the people know which girls were fit for bi’ah and which girls were not? **A:** **R’ Chana bar Bizna in the name of R’ Shimon Chasida** says, they passed the girls in front of the titz, and the girls who were fit for bi’ah took on a yellowish complexion.
 - **R’ Yaakov bar Idi in the name of R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** paskens like **R’ Shimon ben Yochai**. **R’ Zeira** asked **R’ Yaakov bar Idi**, did you hear that explicitly from **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** or did you infer it from something else that he said? The statement that he could have inferred it from was that **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said that it once happened that **Rebbi** found a girl who had converted when less than 3 years old who then married a Kohen, and **Rebbi** allowed them to remain married. **R’ Yaakov** answered that he had heard it explicitly. **R’ Zeira** explained, the reason this inference is not a sure proof that **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** holds like **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** is because that case may be different since they were already married, as we find that **Rav and R’ Yochanan** say that although a Kohen Gadol may not marry a bogeres or a girl who lost her besulim due to injury, if they have married, they may remain married.
 - **Q:** We can’t compare the case of allowing the Kohen Gadol to remain married to the case of the girl convert, because the reason why the Kohen Gadol may remain married in those cases is because the girl will anyway eventually become a bogeres under him or lose her besulos under him. However, allowing the convert to marry the Kohen can’t be based on this logic, because there is no basis to say that he can remain married since she will anyway become a zonah under him!? If so, the fact that **Rebbi** allowed them to remain married is a sure proof that he would allow them to get married in the first place!?
 - We find that **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** held in practice that a Kohen may not marry a convert even if she converted before her 3rd birthday.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** said that the graves of goyim do not give off tumas ohel. He based this on a pasuk that teaches that Yidden are referred to as “adam”, and goyim are not.
 - **Q:** We find pesukim that refer to goyim as “adam”? **A:** That is when they are discussed in comparison to animals.
 - **Q:** We find that Moshe instructed the soldiers to be “metaher” themselves even though they only killed or touched goyim. We see that corpses of goyim give off tumah as well!? **A:** There was a concern that maybe a Jew got killed at battle as well.
 - The **Rabanan** who argue and say that goyim do give off tumas ohel say that the pasuk tells us that not one Jew was missing. We see that Moshe’s concern was based on the corpses of goyim. **R’ Shimon ben Yochai** would say that the pasuk means that not one Jew was led to sin with the non-Jewish women, but there may have been Jews that were killed in battle.

- **Ravina** said, the reason they had to purify themselves was that although corpses of goyim don't give off tumas ohel, they do give off tumah via touching and carrying, and that was the concern that Moshe had.