



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

### Yevamos Daf Pey Tes

#### EIN LAH KESUBAH

- The reason for this is, the whole purpose of a kesubah is to prevent divorce from taking place easily. Here, we want them to get divorced, so there is no reason for the kesubah.

#### EIN LAH PEIROS V'LO MEZONOS V'LO BELAOS

- These items are a stipulation of the kesubah, and since she does not get her kesubah, she does not get the stipulations of the kesubah either.

#### NATLA MIZEH U'MIZEH

- **Q:** It seems obvious that she must return what she took!? **A:** We would think that once it is in her possession she need not return it. The Mishna teaches that she must return it even then.

#### HAVLAD MAMZER

- A Mishna says that one may not separate terumah from tamei produce for tahor produce. If one does so b'shogeg, it is a valid terumah. If one does so b'meizid, it is as if he did nothing.
  - **Q:** What is meant by "it is as if he did nothing"? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, nothing at all is accomplished, and even the produce separated as terumah reverts to its tevel status. **R' Nossan the son of R' Oshaya** said, it means that he needs to separate terumah again, however the produce that was separated as terumah retains its terumah status.
    - **R' Chisda** doesn't hold like **R' Nossan**, because if we say the separated terumah retains its status, then people will not separate terumah for a second time.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that one who separates produce as terumah and it turns out to be spoiled, it is considered terumah, but he must again separate terumah. This is problematic according to **R' Chisda**!? **A:** In this Mishna he is a shogeg, whereas in the last Mishna it was discussing where he did it b'meizid.
    - **Q:** The first quoted Mishna said that for a shogeg he does not have to separate terumah again!? **A:** In this second Mishna he is a shogeg which is bordering on being a meizid, because he should have tasted the produce before separating it as terumah. That is why he must separate again.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that when one gives terumah from an unperforated flower pot for produce of a perforated flower pot and it is done b'meizid, it is considered terumah, but he must separate terumah again. This is not like **R' Chisda** who said it is as if he did nothing at all!? **A:** Since there are 2 separate pots here, people will not fail to separate the terumah a second time.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that when one separates from a perforated pot for a non-perforated pot, the Kohen may not use that terumah until he separates terumah and maaser (from someplace else) for the terumah that was taken for the non-perforated pot. If so, how does **R' Nossan** say that when done b'meizid the terumah is considered terumah, which would mean that the Kohen may use it immediately? **A:** In the case of the tamei terumah, D'Oraisa it is a good separation of terumah, as stated by **R' Illai**.
    - **Q:** **Rabbah** asked **R' Chisda**, according to you, although D'Oraisa the separated produce has the status of terumah, the **Rabanan** decided that due to the concern mentioned above, the produce loses its terumah status. How do the **Rabanan** have the right to uproot something from the Torah!? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, our Mishna says that the child from the first husband is a mamzer. Now D'Oraisa she is his wife, so the child is not a mamzer, and yet the **Rabanan** said that the child is a mamzer, which then allows him to marry a mamzeres!?

- **Q: Rabbah** said, **Shmuel** and **R' Yochanan** both say that the child would be assur to a mamzeres. The **Rabanan** were only goizer that the child would be assur to a regular Jewess.
- **R' Chisda** sent to **Rabbah**, we find that the **Rabanan** can uproot something from the Torah, because the **Rabanan** have said that a man who married a minor who has no father (in which case the marriage is only D'Rabanan), inherits his wife at some point. Now, D'Oraisa this girl's father should inherit her, and yet we see that the **Rabanan** said that the husband inherits her!
  - **Rabbah** said, this is no proof, because the **Rabanan** could do that based on the concept (learned from a pasuk) that Beis Din may deem any property as hefker, and they therefore may make such decisions on monetary matters.
- **R' Chisda** said, the **Rabanan** also said that the husband who is a Kohen can make himself tamei to this minor wife if she dies. We see that **Rabanan** can uproot something that is stated in the Torah!
  - **Rabbah** said, the reason he can become tamei to her is that he may do so even D'Oraisa, because since he is the only one who inherits her, no one else will bother with her burial and she therefore gets the status of a "mes mitzvah", to whom a Kohen may make himself tamei.
- **R' Chisda** said, the **Rabanan** also allow her to eat terumah based on this D'Rabanan marriage. We see that **Rabanan** can uproot something that is stated in the Torah!
  - **Rabbah** said, this permission was only given for D'Rabanan terumah.