

Points to Ponder

הערות של רב יחיאל גרינהויז

יבמות דף קי"ח

- 1. When the אחת אומרת מת ואחת אומרת לא מת, does the second lady have to say that she saw him alive, or is she just contradicting the first one by saying that on that day, you didn't see him because we were together in a different place?
- 2. The גמרא discusses the נאמנות of a צרה to contradict the testimony of her co-wife. The גמרא suggests that she may claim that their husband didn't die even though she knows that he did die, just to cause her צרה grief. If she knows for sure that their husband died, so she is no longer her צרה? Why would she still want to hurt her co-wife?
- 3. Further to the above if she knows that he died and is only trying to cause the צרה grief, wouldn't she rather testify for herself also, that he died, just like her co-wife did and remarry?
- 4. If אכחשה are considered הכחשה, what would be the דין if both testify that he died, but on different days? We know for example that if 2 עדים testify that they saw the new moon at different times, we don't say that since both saw the moon we can accept them, why is our case of different?

- 5. ואפילו שהיא נשאת תמות נפשה עם פלשתים writes ואפילו שהיא נשאת תמות נפשה עם פלשתים. What does he mean with the last sentence? Why is this necessary?
- 6. If someone is מקדש one of 5 wives, and doesn't know which one he was מקדש, the מקדש says that according to רבי טרפון he gives each a גא, and leaves one כתובה for all 5. אין זו דרך מוציא מידי עבירה What is the עבירה? We understand in the earlier case that eating עבירה is an עבירה for a עבירה, but here he can stay married to all if he wants to, so what's the

> לע"נ אבי מורי הרב יעקב בן ר׳ קיים משה יצחק ז"ל לע״נ הרב צבי ליפא בן יחיאל ישראל זצ״ל