



Yevamos Daf 30 is Dedicated

ברוך געציל בן יהודה הכהן לע"נ

לע"נ Yevamos Perek Gimmel is Dedicated

מרת רבקה בת ר' אליהו ז"ל

הח"ר אברהם בן ר' מאיר הלוי ז"ל

מרת האלע בת הח"ר משה הלוי ז"ל

יבמות דף ל

1. On the first Mishna רב נחמן says, from here we can deduce that there is no זיקה. His proof is from the fact that the משנה says that if the 3rd brother did מאמר on his late brother's widow his wife gets חליצה, therefore we see that without מאמר she would be eligible for יבום. Why can't we say that without מאמר she would still only get חליצה, but the Mishna is telling us that with מאמר we still NEED חליצה? This would also fit better into the words of the משנה, because if the Mishna intended to teach about זיקה, it can do so more directly.
2. On the second משנה the גמרא asks why we need both this משנה as well as the previous משנה. If in the first משנה whereby the אשה is not the primary wife, she exempts her co-wife, than of course in the second משנה that the אשה is the primary wife she exempts the co-wife. Why would it make a difference who is first? At the time of ליבום, בפילה, both wives are falling from the same brother.
3. In the third משנה we learn about נאסרה. The משנה discusses the ערוה of אשה, but is silent about her צרה (see תוס'). Why would נאסרה effect one and not the other? Is the problem of נאסרה connected to the first brother אישות and not to the נשוי נכרית? Meaning that in order to exempt a co-wife, the ערוה needs to relate to the same marriage, and not a previous one?
4. רב says that any יבמה that is not able to do יבום when her husband died, becomes like an אשת אח שיש לו. Why is this necessary, anytime that there is no מצוה of יבום we have a לאו of אשת אח?
5. If there are brothers capable of doing יבום in addition to the brother who cannot because he is married to the יבמה's sister, why is she considered יבמה בפילה בשעת נפילה יבמה יבוא עליה? Clearly she is able to do יבום with one of the brothers, so how can she be called אשת אח שיש לו בנימ, which is אסורה ליבום?
6. In case of a ספק קידושין equivalent to ספק גירושין, in which we don't know if the גט landed in her אמות ד' or in his, we would not even require a חליצה for the צרה. Rashi explains that before the husband died (and before he threw her the גט?) the צרה acquired a status of ערוה צרת. How would this apply if we hold מיתה מפלה?

If you have any comments or suggestions please email me at Ygrunhaus@gmail.com

לע"נ אבי מורי הרב יעקב בן ר' קיים משה יצחק ז"ל

רפואה שלימה לרב רפאל צבי ליפא בן אסתר רכאל