



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

Yevamos Daf Zayin

- The Gemara now gives a different reason why we need the pasuk to teach that the mitzvah of yibum does not override the lo saasei with kares of marrying one's wife's sister. We would have said that the ervah of "eishes ach" (one's brother's wife) was included in the generality of all the arayos, and was then singled out as being overridden by the mitzvah of yibum. We would say that when something of the generalization is singled out, it teaches regarding everything in that generalization, and therefore teaches that all arayos are overridden for yibum. That is why we need the pasuk to teach otherwise. We find this concept in a pasuk which singles out a Korbon Shelamim as making one who eats it while tamei to be subject to kares, even though the pasuk already stated this in a generalization regarding all korbanos. We said there that Shelamim was singled out to teach that the entire generalization only applies to animals destined to be brought on the Mizbe'ach, as opposed to those animals brought for bedek habayis.
 - **Q:** In the case of the Shelamim, the generalization is a prohibition and the one singled out is also written for that same issur. However, regarding arayos, the generalization speaks of the issur, and the one singled out speaks of a when it is mutar!? If anything, the case of eishes ach is more similar to the rule that says that when something was included in a generalization, and is then singled out with a new Halacha (as here, where the eishes ach is permitted to the brother for yibum), that thing may not be returned to be included in the generalization unless we are specifically told to do so by the pasuk!? Therefore, we would not learn the case of a wife's sister from the case of eishes ach, and the question returns as to why the Torah had to teach that the case of the wife's sister remains assur even in the case of yibum!? **A:** We would think that we would learn an analogy (a "mah matzinu") from eishas ach. We would say that just like eishes ach is an ervah, and yet is mutar in the case of yibum, so too a wife's sister, which is an ervah, becomes mutar in the case of yibum.
 - **Q:** The cases are different and can't be compared!? The case of eishes ach is only one issur, whereas the case of the wife's sister is 2 issurim – she is his wife's sister *and* is his brother's wife – and maybe that is why it can't be overridden!? **A:** We would say that once one issur is removed the other issur gets removed along with it. We find this concept in a Braisa regarding when a metzorah on his 8th day of tahara (when he must stick parts of his body into the Azarah) becomes a baal kerai (who is not allowed to go into the Azarah). If this 8th day falls on Erev Pesach, we allow him to stick these parts into the Azarah even though he is a baal kerai. **Ulla** explained the Braisa to mean, that since it is mutar for him to do even though he is a metzorah, we allow him to do it even though he is a baal kerai as well.
 - **Q:** In **Ulla's** case, he was first a metzorah (the issur that is first lifted) and then became a baal kerai. Our case would only be similar to that when the woman first became his eishes ach (she married the dead brother) and then became his wife's sister (the living brother then married the sister). What would be the reason to say this when she was first assur to him as his wife's sister!? Also, even in this second case, it would only be like **Ulla's** case when the brother married her, he died, and then the living brother married the sister. In that case, since she was mutar for a moment, we would think that she should remain mutar even if she now becomes his wife's sister. However, if she became his

wife's sister while the first brother still alive, and she therefore never became mutar to him, that would be like a case where the metzorah became a baal keri on the night going into the 8th day, in which case even **Ulla** would agree that he may not have any body parts enter the Azarah!? **A:** We must say that the word "aleha" and the drasha that says that his wife's sister is not allowed in yibum is only needed in a case where the first brother died before the second brother married the sister. It is only in that case that we would think that since she was mutar she would no longer become assur. We need the pasuk to teach that she does become assur.