13.16.1

119a (משנה א׳) → 120a (דאינסיב לכהן)

## ויאמֶר שִׁמְשוֹן **תָּמוֹת נַפְשִׁי עִם פָּלְשָׁתִּים** וַיֵּט בְּכֹחַ וַיִּפֹּל הַבַּיִת עַל הַסְרָנִים ... *שופטים טו*ל

- I משנה אי: status of צרה when she learns that her husband died
  - a if husband travels with צרה, she may not remarry nor accept שבום, must wait to learn if *that* צרה gave birth i *observation*: only have to be worried about *that* נערה giving birth, not another (of whom we aren't aware)
  - b (if husband was childless but had no brothers) no need for concern that her mother-in-law gave birth
    - i if her mother-in-law left while pregnant:
      - 1 μ"π must wait to find out
      - 2 ר' יהושע may remarry without finding out
- II Authorship
  - a רישא indicates that it is ריש who takes minority probability into account
    - i explanation: she may not marry, even thought most married women give birth (i.e. נוגערה likely had child)
    - ii alternative suggestion: perhaps רבנן would agree here and only use רוב when it is "in front of us"
      - 1 example: case of 10 stores, 9 selling בשר שחוטה
      - 2 however: in our case, it isn't a case of רוב that we can demonstrably quantify (e.g. 9/10 stores)
      - 3 *rejection*: רבנן employ רוב even when it isn't demonstrably quantifiable e.g. ייבום קטן וקטנה (ייבום קטן וקטנה)
    - iii challenge: סיפא seems to run against ר"מ, since we aren't concerned that the M-i-L gave birth to a living son
    - iv *defense*: once she has been מוחזקת as a מוחרת לשוק, we aren't concerned
    - v challenge: in the רישא, she was מוחזקת as a זקוקה לייבום, yet we don't allow ייבום ייבום
    - vi answer1: (רנב"י) the איסור ברת (אשת אח) the איסור ברת (אשת אח) the איסור ברת (אשת היש) the איסור נרמה לשוק) the לאו
    - vii answer2: (רבא don't distinguish between איסור כרת and איסור לאו
      - the רישא involves a conflict between (חזקה (most women give birth)→marry out] and חזקה
        (a) result: add the possibility of מפילות to the הקוח → 50/50
      - 2 the סיפא involves a חזקה לשוק (no brother) and a רובא לשוק (living sons are a minority of pregnancies)
        - (a) *result*: possibility of a living brother born is מיעוטא דמיעוטא even ר״מ ignores that
- III Consequences of circumstances in משנה א' how long must she wait to marry?
  - a חליצה 9 months; by then, the צרה either gave birth or never did perform אינה in any case
  - b אויצה never; since, if she performs חליצה and then we learn that the צרה gave birth, we'll allow her to marry a and someone may not have known about the "uprooted רו" and will think that we're permitting הלוצה לכהן
  - c challenge: משנה) if she testifies that her husband or newborn child died first, we believe her
    - i *specific*: why not be concerned that witnesses will come forward that her husband died first, permitting her to כהונה etc.
    - ii answer1: circumstance גרושה
    - iii answer2: circumstance she testifies that it all happened in seclusion no witnesses are possible
- IV משנה ב' two sisters-in-law's (2 women married to 2 brothers) testimony about their respective husbands
  - a if each testifies that her husband died both are אסורות because of the other's husband
    - i *explanation*: A's testimony is only valid vis-à-vis A, not for B; A's husband may still be alive to be מייבם B
    - b if A has witnesses to her husband's death and B doesn't A is מותרת and B is מותרת and B is מותרת
    - c if A has children and B has no children A is מותרת and B is not
    - d if they were both מתייבם to brothers C&D who then died:
      - i אסורות still אסורות previous status holds
      - ii מותרת once they became מותרות ליבם, they are also מותרת to others
        - 1 *analysis*: what is "ר"א's reason?
          - (a) Lemma1: a woman's testimony is valid for her צרה OR
          - (b) *Lemma*2: a woman won't testify and thereby endanger herself
          - (c) Split the difference: can we marry off the צרה before the index wife (who testified) (1 yes; 2 no)
          - (d) Inference: from his wording, seems that we accept her testimony because she won't harm herself
          - (e) *Rejection: רבנו*'s statement was geared to רבנן (who maintain that she would endanger herself v.1)
          - (f) Proof: צרה allows a צרה to marry on the testimony of the other wife who was permitted
          - (g) Rejection: other wife was permitted and married
            - (i) *Observation*: only works if she married a כהן; if not, she may have been divorced and is trying to harm the צרה
    - e variation: if B has witnesses and sons and A has neither both מותרות