13.10.4; 92a (משנה ג') → 94a (דפוסל בכהונה)

ז. אַשָּׁה זֹנָה וַחֶלֶלָה לֹא יִקְחוּ וְאָשֶׁה מָאִישָׁה מֵאִישָׁה לֹא יִקְחוּ כִי קַדשׁ הוּא לֵאלֹהְיוֹ: ייִקרא פרק כא פסוק ז
בִי יַשְׁבוּ אַחִים יַחְדָּוּ וּמְת אַחַד מֵהָם וֹבְן אִין וֹ לֹא תַּחְיָה אֲשֶׁת הַמְּנָה לְאִישׁ זָר יְבְמָה לֵא לֶלְיָף וּלְקָחָה לוֹ לְאִשָּׁה וְיִבְּמָה: דברים כה:ה
גַּי יַשְׁבֹּוְ לְפְנֵי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךּ בַּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר לְשַׁבּן שְׁמוֹ שָׁם מַעְשֵׁר זְּבְנָךְ ...לְמֵעוֹ תַּלְמֵד לְיִנְאָה אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֶיךּ בְּלַ הַבְּעְחִים עָלְיוֹ: מ"ב יח:כא
עַתָּה הָבֵּוּ לְאַשְׁעָלְת הַקְבָּוּ הְלָאֲמֶת יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט: ישעיהו פרק מב פסוק ג

- משנה ג' further cases of misreported death of husband
 - a case #1: man and his (only) son go abroad
 - i report #1: man died first (thus removing possibility of זיקה) then son died and she married "out"
 - 1 reality #1: reported back that first the son died, then the husband, creating זיקת ייבום
 - 2 ruling: she must leave new and old husband and the children from both "ממזרים are ממזרים are ממזרים
 - (a) meaning: שמועה = before אחרון שמועה = after שמועה
 - (b) Attribution: must be ממזרות who reckons that חייבי לאוין generate ממזרות
 - (c) Related dispute: תפיסת קידושין ביבמה
 - (i) Clearly negating: רב, following v. 2 לא תהיה
 - 1. therefore: she has no נישואין is meaningful for our case and requires a גט is meaningful for our case and requires a
 - (ii) Unclear: אמואל does את היה שמואל mean "may not" or "cannot"? →require מספק)
 - (iii) Ruling1: follows → יבם ישראל פו יבם hew husband may give her a גט she may marry the יבם
 - (iv) Ruling 2(ר' ינאי): follows רב
 - 1. challenge (יוחנן: it's an explicit משנה given w/delay לאחר חליצה are invalid
 - 2. response (ד' ינאי): indeed, that's the reason
 - 3. comment (ד"ל): otherwise, we would have assigned that משנה to ד"ע
 - a. Challenge: but ר"ע maintains קידושין (→ אדם מקנה should be valid in any case)
 - b. Response: אין אדם מקנה דשלבל"ע agrees that אין אדם מקנה דשלבל"ע side reason given for his ruling in נדרים
 - c. Contra: רנב"י holds that אדם מקנה דשלבל"ע holds רב"ע, ר"מ, רבי, ר' חייא, ר' ינאי, רב, ר' הונא
 - i. Case 1: (ר' הונא) selling futures on fruit tree
 - ii. Case 2: (רב) future, retroactive sale is valid
 - iii. $\mathit{Case 3}$: (ר' ינאי) even if it didn't yet arrive
 - iv. Case 3b: (ר' חייא) approved of ינאי 'ז's ruling, (v. 3), even though he was made to read in a dream-thought the reference was v. 4 (bad), but it was v. 5 (good)
 - v. Case 4: (רבי) ability to buy an עבד ע"מ לשחררו
 - vi. Case 5: קידושין based on future availability valid
 - vii. Case 6: (ראב"י) הפרשת תרו"מ based on future ripening valid
 - viii. Case 7: (נדר wife's נדר to prevent husband from her future earnings is a valid נדר
 - ii report #2: son died first, then father (generating ייבום) and she had ייבום
 - 1 reality #2: reported back that first the husband died, destroying זיקה
 - 2 ruling: she must leave both the ממזרים and her husband and the children from both "ממזרים are ממזרים are ממזרים
 - iii observation: עד is believed to generate ייבום
 - l proof: since in our case the child is deemed a ממזר →there was only 1 witness (then 2 came and refuted)
 - 2 version: question asked about 1 witness to permit a potential יבמה לשוק same proof
 - 3 alternatively: perhaps it is תרי ותרי חרי obut the latter two are עדי הזמה (automatic trumping of 1st 2)
 - 4 *contra*: (רב אשי) 1 witness is not believed (statement implying that he is is credited to "ז; since יש ממזר she would be careful למ"ל that 1 witness is never enough);
 - (a) Reason: she may hate (or love) יבם and be likely to "lightly" believe testimony
 - b case #2: man went abroad
 - i *report #1*: man died, then she married another
 - 1 reality: reported he was alive at time of her remarriage, then he died
 - 2 ruling: she must leave her new husband and children from "ראשון" are ממזרים but not from "אחרון" but not from "אחרון"
 - ii report #2: man died, then she accepted קידושין from another (no ביאה
 - 1 reality: he shows up
 - 2 ruling: she may return to her first husband
 - (a) addendum: even if the 2^{nd} husband gives her a גט, she's כשרה לכהונה
 - (b) support: מדרש on v. 1 must be מאשה to be a valid גע to be a valid גע
 - (i) Observation: he could have built a more elegant דיח הגט involving ריח הגט