



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

### Yevamos Daf Tzaddik

- **R' Chisda** said, we see that the **Rabanan** have the ability to uproot something from the Torah from the following Braisa. The Braisa says, if a non-Kohen ate tamei terumah by mistake, he must pay back the Kohen in the form of chullin that is tahor. If he pays back with chullin that is tamei, **Sumchos in the name of R' Meir** says, if it was done b'shogeg, it is considered a good repayment. If it was done b'meizid, it is not a valid repayment. Now, D'Oraisa this is a valid repayment, to the point that if the Kohen were to take this tamei chullin and give it to a woman as kiddushin, it would create a marriage D'Oraisa, and yet the **Rabanan** say it is not a valid repayment and would say the kiddushin would not be valid!
  - **Rabbah** said, **R' Meir** means that the tamei chullin remains a valid payment in that it becomes terumah and belongs to the Kohen, but the non-Kohen must then give another repayment in the form of tahor chullin.
- **R' Chisda** brings a proof from a Braisa that says that if the blood of a korbán became tamei, and the Kohen threw it onto the Mizbe'ach anyway, if it was done b'shogeg, the korbán is valid. If it was done b'meizid, the korbán is not valid. This invalidity is only D'Rabanan, because a Braisa says that D'Oraisa the tzitz makes such a blood offering valid. Now, this would mean that the **Rabanan** will require the person to bring another korbán, which D'Oraisa is unnecessary and should be assur. We see that the **Rabanan** uproot an issur D'Oraisa!
  - **R' Yose bar Chanina** said, when the Braisa says that the korbán is not valid, it means that the meat may not be eaten by the Kohanim, but the korbán itself is valid and therefore another korbán will not be brought.
    - **Q:** Even the fact that the meat will not be eaten shows that the **Rabanan** may uproot a D'Oraisa, because we learn from a pasuk that the Kohanim are supposed to eat the meat, and through that effect a kaparah for the bringer of the korbán!? **A: R' Yose bar Chanina** said, the **Rabanan** are only preventing an action from being done ("shev v'ahl taaseh"). It is only in this manner that the **Rabanan** have the ability to uproot a D'Oraisa, because it is not considered as uprooting a D'Orasia altogether.
    - **R' Chisda** said, I was going to bring proofs from many other halachos D'Oraisa that the **Rabanan** said not to do (e.g., taking a lulav on Shabbos, wearing tzitzis on a linen garment, and others). However, based on this last answer, I cannot bring them as a proof.
- **R' Chisda** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that the pasuk of "eilav tishmi'un" teaches that one must listen to a Navi even if he says to do an aveirah, like Eliyahu did on Har HaKarmel.
  - **Rabbah** said, there the pasuk specifically allows for the uprooting of the mitzvah, and is therefore different.
    - **Q:** Maybe we should learn from there that the **Rabanan** may do so as well? **A:** The pasuk only allows for this in instances that require such conduct to prevent widespread aveiros from being done.
- **R' Chisda** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that the **Rabanan** disallowed a method of nullifying a get, which D'Orasia would be effective. We see the **Rabanan** could uproot a D'Oraisa!
  - **Rabbah** said, the reason they can do so over there is because all marriages are done subject to the will of the **Rabanan**, and the **Rabanan** can therefore annul the original marriage between this couple, thus making them no longer married.
    - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, this makes sense when someone gave kiddushin of money. We can say that the **Rabanan** deem that exchange of money as a gift and thereby nullify the marriage. However, if the kiddushin was done with bi'ah,

how can they nullify that action? **A: R' Ashi** said, the **Rabanan** give that bi'ah the status of zenus, and not as an act of kiddushin.

- **R' Chisda** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that **R' Elazar ben Yaakov** said that he heard that Beis Din may give malkus and even misah for issurim D'Rabanan when the situation calls for it. We see that the **Rabanan** may uproot a D'Oraisa
  - **Rabbah** said, this is only allowed in instances that require such conduct to prevent widespread aveiros from being done.

V'LO ZEH V'ZEH MITAM'IN LAH

- **Q:** How do we know that the first husband (who is her true husband) may not become tamei to her if he is a Kohen? **A:** We learn from the pesukim that a Kohen may only become tamei to a wife that is valid to him, not for a wife that is passul to him.

V'LO ZEH V'ZEH ZAKA'IN BIMTZI'ASA...

- The reason the finds of a wife go to the husband is to prevent hatred between them. Here, we don't mind if there will be hatred, because they must separate.

U'BIMAASEH YADEHA

- The **Rabanan** instituted that a woman's earning belong to her husband because he is obligated to support her. Here, he does not have this obligation, so he is therefore not entitled to her earnings.

V'LO MEIFER NIDAREHA

- The Torah allows a man to annul certain vows of his wife so that she not become disgusting to him. In this situation, we have no problem if she becomes disgusting to him, because they must separate anyway.

HUYSA BAS YISRAEL NIFSILA MIN HAKEHUNA...

- **Q:** It seems obvious that she is assur to a Kohen, since she was mezaneh!? **A:** The chiddush is the next part of the Mishna, that says that a Leviya becomes assur to eat maaser.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a Leviya does not become assur to eat maaser just because she is mezaneh!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, the **Rabanan** penalized her in this case, for having gotten married on the testimony of a single witness.