



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

Yevamos Daf Ches

- Another reason we would think that one could marry his wife's sister (or any of the other arayos) in a yibum situation is based on a hekesh of **R' Yonah**, which compares all arayos to each other based on a pasuk. Based on that, we would say that just like the ervah of eishes ach gets removed to allow for yibum, so too all the other arayos should get removed for yibum. That is why we need the pasuk of "aleha" by achos ishto to teach that yibum is not allowed.
 - **Q: R' Acha Midifti** asked **Ravina**, why are we more inclined to compare the other arayos to achos ishto and disallow yibum, maybe we should compare the other arayos to eishes ach and allow yibum!? **A:** When we have a choice to compare with a resulting chumrah or to compare with a resulting kula, we choose to compare with a resulting chumra. **A2:** The case of eishes ach only needs to have one ervah removed, whereas all the other arayos need to have 2 arayos removed to allow for yibum (the ervah itself, in addition to the ervah of eishes ach). Therefore we compare all the other arayos to achos ishto which would also need to have 2 layers of ervah removed.
- **Rava** said, in truth we would know that the arayos cannot be subject to yibum. The pasuk is only needed to teach that even the co-wives are not subject to yibum.
 - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier specifically said that the word "aleha" teaches that the ervah of achos ishto is not subject to yibum. We see that the pasuk is needed for that!? **A:** The Braisa says that as an introduction to teach that the co-wife is not subject to yibum, but in truth the pasuk is not needed to teach that about the ervah herself.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says that the pasuk says "vilakcha" instead of "vilakach" and "viyibma" instead of "viyibeim" to teach that the arayos and the tzaros are assur. We see that a pasuk is needed for the arayos themselves!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that the "tzaros of the arayos" are assur based on these words.
 - **Q:** There are 2 words for the drasha, which would mean that one is used for the arayos themselves!? **A:** One word teaches to assur the tzara for yibum, and one serves to allow her to marry her tzara's ervah in any other circumstance.
 - **R' Ashi** said, our Mishna infers this as well, because it says that "15 women patur their tzaros". It doesn't say anything about the fact that they themselves are patur.
 - **Q:** The reason we don't need a pasuk to teach that the ervah herself is assur for yibum is because we wouldn't think that the assei could override the lo saasei that has kares. If so, for this same reason we should also not need a pasuk for the tzara!? **A:** The word "aleha" in the pasuk is only needed to teach that the tzara is mutar in a situation other than yibum.
 - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **Rava**, according to this reasoning, maybe we should say that the ervah herself is mutar when it is not the situation of yibum? **A:** We would say a kal v'chomer – if she is assur even when there is a mitzvah, for sure she would be assur when there is no mitzvah.
 - **Q:** The kal v'chomer is no good, because the case of tzara shows that one could be assur when there is a mitzvah and mutar when there is no mitzvah!? **A:** The pasuk regarding achos ishto teaches that she is assur "b'chayeha" – in all circumstances.
 - **Q:** That word is needed to teach that the sister is only assur as long as the wife is alive!? **A:** The pasuk uses the plural ("litzror") and the singular ("ervasa"). This teaches that at times the ervah and tzara are

both assur (at the time of yibum) and at times only the ervah is assur (when there is no yibum).

- **Q:** Maybe the word “aleha” comes to teach that even the ervah herself is mutar for yibum!? **A:** That can’t be, because then we wouldn’t have a case where one is assur and one is mutar (between the ervah and the tzara). At the time of yibum both would be mutar and at any other time both would be assur.
- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that **Rebbi** said, the pasuk says “vilakcha” instead of “vilakach” and “viyibma” instead of “viyibeim” to teach that the arayos and the tzaros are assur. Where does the pasuk say anything about tzaros? Also, we said that we learn the Halacha of tzaros from “litzror”!? **A: Rebbi** uses “litzror” for a different drasha, like **R’ Shimon**. With regard to the first question, he darshens the pasuk of “ulikacha” to refer to 2 takings, and it means that when there is the possibility of 2 takings (two co-wives), and one may not be taken, the other may not be taken either.
 - The **Rabanan** who argue on **Rebbi**, say that “ulikacha” teaches that once he does yibum he would need a “get” to divorce her, and after doing so he would be allowed to remarry her. “Viyibma” teaches that yibum may be done even against the woman’s will.
 - **Rebbi** learns the first Halacha from fact that the pasuk refers to her as “a wife”, and learns the second Halacha from the words “yevama yavo aleha”.