



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

### Yevamos Daf Tes

- **Q:** We said that **Rebbi** has a different source to teach that a wife's sister (and every ervah) is not subject to yibum. What will he use the extra word of "aleha" to teach? **A:** He uses it to teach that one is only chayav a chatas for doing an aveirah b'shogeg, if the aveirah is the type for which one would be chayav kares if it was done b'meizid. **Rebbi** says in a Braisa, we learn this from a gezeirah shava. The pasuk says regarding the tzibbur who must bring a chatas, "V'noda hachatas asher chatu **aleha**". He says that there is a gezeirah shava from the pasuk of a wife's sister (on the word "aleha"), and this teaches that just like a wife's sister is something that carries a kares penalty, so too a chatas is only brought for an inadvertent aveirah that carries the kares penalty if it were to be done b'meizid. The other groups/types of people who must bring a chatas are then learned from this (via gezeirah shavos, and other forms of drasha).
  - **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** (who use "aleha" to teach regarding yibum) learn this concept? **A:** They learn it from the drasha of **R' Yehoshua**, who says, the pasuk immediately before the pasuk of Avodah Zara says, "Torah achas yihiyeh lachem l'oseh bishgagah", and thereby makes a hekesh from avodah zara to the shogeg of every other aveirah, and teaches that just like avodah zarah is something that carries kares when done b'meizid and chatas when done b'shogeg, so too for all aveiros, one is only chayav a chatas for a shogeg if the aveirah carries the kares penalty when done b'meizid. The other groups/types of people who must bring a chatas are then learned from this (via gezeirah shavos, and other forms of drasha).
    - **Q:** What does **Rebbi** darshen with this pasuk? **A:** He darshens it as it is darshened in a Braisa. The Braisa says, we would think that since we treat an individual who worships avodah zara differently than a majority of a city who does so (the former is killed with stoning and his possessions are passed to his inheritors, whereas the latter are killed by the sword and their possessions are destroyed), that their korbanos for having done the aveirah b'shogeg should also be different. The pasuk of "Torah achas" therefore teaches that they all bring the same korbon.
      - **Q: R' Chilkiyah of Hagrunya** asked, what else would we think that the majority should bring? Every other possible animal is already brought for another category of chatas!? **A:** We would think that either they should bring a par for a chatas and a sa'ir for an olah (which is a unique combination not brought for any aveirah), or that they have no form of kaparah whatsoever.
- **Levi** asked **Rebbi**, why does the Mishna only list 15 women? Why doesn't it mention a 16<sup>th</sup> woman as well? **Rebbi** said, **Levi** was very wrong for suggesting that there should be a 16<sup>th</sup> woman who would fit the category. You (**Levi**) think that the 16<sup>th</sup> woman should be a case where a man rapes a woman and has a son from that act, and this woman then marries a different son of that man, and her husband then dies without children. The woman would then fall to her own son for yibum. This would seem to be a 16<sup>th</sup> case of a situation where a woman would be patur from yibum, and would patur her tzaros, etc. However, that case would be subject to a machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and the **Rabanan** (**R' Yehuda** says that one is forbidden to marry a woman who was raped by his father), and our Mishna does not list any case which would be subject to a machlokes.

- **Q:** The next perek lists cases of “issur mitzvah” (a ervah D’Rabanan) and “issur kedusha” (e.g. a mamzeres), which are subject to a machlokes between **R’ Akiva** and the **Rabanan!**? **A:** In our perek the Mishna does not speak of cases of machlokes.
- **Q:** Our Mishna only follows **B”H**, because **B”S** allow the tzaros for yibum!? **A:** Since we clearly follow **B”H**, we don’t consider a machlokes with **B”S** to be a case of machlokes.
- **Q:** The case in the Mishna of the wife of a brother who died before the other brother was born, is subject to a machlokes between **R’ Shimon** and the **Rabanan (R’ Shimon** says that the wife of the brother *does* fall to yibum to the brother who was born after the first brother’s death), and yet it is listed in the Mishna!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a case where even **R’ Shimon** would agree that she is assur to him – the case is where the new brother is born after the first brother’s death, but before another brother did yibum to her.
- **Q:** **Rav** and **R’ Chiya** both say that it is possible for all 15 cases of the Mishna to be a case where 2 brothers, who were married to 2 sisters, die without children, and these 2 sisters fall for yibum to 2 other brothers, and one sister is totally assur to one brother and totally mutar to the other brother, and the second sister is totally assur to the other one and totally mutar to the first one. **R’ Safra** explained, that the only way that this scenario can exist in the case of a brother who was born after the childless brother died is according to **R’ Shimon**. We see that the Mishna does discuss cases subject to machlokes!? **A:** **Rebbi** does not agree with **Rav** and **R’ Chiya**, and holds that this scenario would not be able to apply to the case of the later born brother in our Mishna.