Perek VI
Daf 60 Amud a

That he does not pay the fine of a seduced woman – שיאו קריאת ככר בכפאתה: Tosafot ask: Since he is obligated to divorce her he must in any case pay her marriage contract. If so, what difference does it make whether he pays the sum as a fine or for the marriage contract? Tosafot offer several answers, one of which is that the Gemara is addressing Torah law, whereas the requirement that he divorce her and pay her marriage contract is by rabbinic law.

A grown woman and a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally, etc. – A High Priest may not marry a woman or a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally. Still, if he married one of these women, he is not forced to divorce her (Rambam Hilkhot Issurei Bia 60a).

The Gemara analyzes this baraita. It states that if he married the woman that he himself raped or seduced, he is married. Rav Huna said that Rav Ashi said: And he must divorce her with a bill of divorce. The Gemara asks: But consider that which the baraita teaches: If he married her, he is married. Since it is obvious that the marriage is technically valid, it must be saying that they are permitted to remain married. Rav Aha bar Yaakov said: No, it means to say that he does not pay the fine of a seduced woman. One who seduced a woman and does not wish to marry her must pay a fine (see Exodus 22:14–15). Since in this case he did marry her, he is not liable to pay the fine even though he is required to divorce her.

The Gemara relates that when Rav Geviha went from Bei Ketil he stated this halakha before Rav Ashi, who said to him: Isn’t it Rav and Rabbi Yohanan who both say: A High Priest may not marry a grown woman and a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally, but if he married one of them he is married?

Apparently, the reason for this halakha is that since she will eventually be a grown woman under him, i.e., while married to him, and she will eventually be a woman whose hymen was torn under him, as she will not remain a virgin, they are permitted to remain married after the fact. Here too, in the case of a High Priest who married a woman he raped or seduced, since she will eventually be a non-virgin under him, the baraita should be understood as stating that they may remain married.

The Gemara concludes: Indeed, this is difficult for Rav Huna.

The baraita cited above taught: With regard to a woman who was raped by another man and a woman seduced by another man, the High Priest may not marry her. And if he married her, Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov says that the child born from this union is a halal, and the Rabbis say the lineage of the offspring is unflawed. Rav Huna said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov. And, so too, Rav Giddel said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov.

NOTES

One who seduced a woman and does not wish to marry her must pay a fine (see Exodus 22:14–15). Since in this case he did marry her, he is not liable to pay the fine even though he is required to divorce her.
The Gemara asks: Does he really hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar? Don’t we maintain that the teaching of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov measures a kav but is clean, i.e., not many of his rulings have been recorded, but those that have been recorded are considered authoritative, and the halakha is always in accordance with his opinion? However, with regard to this ruling of Rabbi Elazar, Rav Amram said that Rav said that the halakha is not in accordance with Rabbi Elazar. The Gemara comments: This is indeed difficult.

Rav Ashi said: This is not the reason for the dispute. Rather, they disagree with regard to whether there is a halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for transgressing a positive mitzva. The marriage of a High Priest to a non-virgin is a violation of the mitzva that a High Priest marry a virgin, but it is not expressed in the Torah as a prohibition against a High Priest marrying a non-virgin. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov holds that there is a halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for violating a positive mitzva, and the Rabbis hold that there is no halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for violating a positive mitzva.

What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov? As it is written: “A widow, or one divorced, or a halala, or a zona, these shall he not take; but a virgin of his own people shall he take for a wife” (Leviticus 21:14), and it states subsequently: “And he shall not profane his seed among his people” (Leviticus 21:15). Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov maintains that this profanation is referring to all of them, i.e., he profanes his seed by marrying any woman unfit for him, including a non-virgin.

And what do the Sages hold? The word “these” concluded discussion of that matter. Consequently, only the prohibitions listed before the phrase “these shall he not take” result in the offspring being a halal. And Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov said: The word “these” comes to exclude a menstruating woman. If a priest has relations with a menstruating woman, the offspring is not a halal, as this is not a prohibition specific to priests.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is it that is taught in the following baraita: From the prohibitions preceding the phrase “these shall he not take” you cause your offspring to be a halal, but you do not cause your offspring to be a halal by having a child with a menstruating woman. In accordance with whose opinion is it? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov. The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, let the verse write the word these at the end, after stating that a High Priest must marry a virgin, in order to make it clear that if he marries a non-virgin their child is a halal. The Gemara responds: Indeed, this is difficult.

HALAKHA

But you do not cause a halal by having a child with a menstruating woman — איה אל tekiya mikra. One who has intercourse with a menstruating woman does not thereby cause her to become a zona. A child conceived by this act is not considered a halal (Rambam Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Biah 19a; Shulhan Arukh, Even Ha’zer 6:8).

NOTES

1. Some say a different version of this statement. Rav Huna said that Rav said: What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov? He holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, that an unmarried man who has intercourse with an unmarried woman has thereby caused her to become a zona. Consequently, since the other man had intercourse with this woman outside of the context of marriage, she is a zona.

2. Rav Amram said that Rav said that the halakha is not in accordance with Rabbi Elazar. The Gemara comments: This is indeed difficult.

3. Rav Ashi said: This is not the reason for the dispute. Rather, they disagree with regard to whether there is a halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for transgressing a positive mitzva. The marriage of a High Priest to a non-virgin is a violation of the mitzva that a High Priest marry a virgin, but it is not expressed in the Torah as a prohibition against a High Priest marrying a non-virgin. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov holds that there is a halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for violating a positive mitzva, and the Rabbis hold that there is no halal from a relationship for which the man and woman are liable for violating a positive mitzva.

4. What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov? As it is written: “A widow, or one divorced, or a halala, or a zona, these shall he not take; but a virgin of his own people shall he take for a wife” (Leviticus 21:14), and it states subsequently: “And he shall not profane his seed among his people” (Leviticus 21:15). Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov maintains that this profanation is referring to all of them, i.e., he profanes his seed by marrying any woman unfit for him, including a non-virgin.

5. And what do the Sages hold? The word “these” concluded discussion of that matter. Consequently, only the prohibitions listed before the phrase “these shall he not take” result in the offspring being a halal. And Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov said: The word “these” comes to exclude a menstruating woman. If a priest has relations with a menstruating woman, the offspring is not a halal, as this is not a prohibition specific to priests.

6. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is it that is taught in the following baraita: From the prohibitions preceding the phrase “these shall he not take” you cause your offspring to be a halal, but you do not cause your offspring to be a halal by having a child with a menstruating woman. In accordance with whose opinion is it? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov. The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, let the verse write the word these at the end, after stating that a High Priest must marry a virgin, in order to make it clear that if he marries a non-virgin their child is a halal. The Gemara responds: Indeed, this is difficult.

§ The Sages taught: With regard to a priest’s betrothed sister, Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda say: He must become impure for her upon her death. Rabbi Yosef and Rabbi Shimon say: He may not become impure for her. With regard to his sister who has been raped or seduced, all agree that he may not become impure for her upon her death. With regard to his sister whose hymen was torn accidentally, he may not become impure for her; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon, as Rabbi Shimon would say the following principle: If his sister was fit for a High Priest, he must become impure for her, but if she was not fit for a High Priest, he may not become impure for her.
Who is near, this is to include a betrothed sister – ḥakamim. Both the ḥakamim who hold that a priest must become impure for his sister even if she was betrothed, and those who hold that he may not, agree that the phrase: Who has had no man, would naturally be understood to mean that a priest becomes impure only for a sister who was never even betrothed. The dispute is whether there is another part of the verse that specifically includes any woman who had been betrothed, because she remains near to her brother. It should be noted that there are Sages cited in the Jerusalem Talmud who held that a sister is presumed to remain a part of one’s family unit until proven otherwise, whereas a betrothed woman is presumed not to be included in her husband’s family unit until proven otherwise.

To include a betrothed woman who was then divorced – הַרְבּוֹת אֶרֶץ. The commentaries disagree about the status of a woman who was married but had not yet had intercourse with her husband. Is her status comparable to that of a betrothed woman with regard to whether her brother becomes impure for her if he is a priest, or is her status comparable to that of a fully married woman? The Ramban rules that she has the status of a betrothed woman and that consequently, Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda hold that her brother must become impure for her. He explains further that if she is divorced without having intercourse, even Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon would agree that her brother must become impure for her. The Rashba holds that as long as she is married, all would agree that her brother does not become impure for her. However, if she is divorced without having intercourse, her brother must become impure for her (see Ritva and Arukh LaḤaṭen).

A woman whose hymen was torn accidentally and a grown woman – יִדְּשֶׁהָ לְרַבּוֹת אֶרֶץ, מֵאִיר לַאֲנוּסָה שִׁמְעוֹן. A priest becomes impure for his sister who never had intercourse with a man, whether a grown woman – בּוֹגֶרֶת. הַקְּרוֹבָה קָא מִטַּמֵּא לַאֲנוּסָה שִׁמְעוֹן, אָמִינָא מַאי שָׁמַע שִׁמְעוֹן? And for his virgin sister who was betrothed, what is their reason? Didn’t Rabbi Meir say that he may not, agree that the phrase: Who has had no man, excludes a betrothed woman? Only when, etc. – בּוֹגֶרֶת אֲרוּסָה בָּא לִי אָמַר, אֲשֶׁר תַּלְמוּד אוֹקַר: וְרַבִּי מִטַּמֵּא אַף לֹא מֵאִיר לַאֲנוּסָה שִׁמְעוֹן. The Gemara answers: Why do I need a verse to include a grown woman? Didn’t Rabbi Meir say that the word “virgin” indicates even a woman who is partly a virgin, i.e., a grown woman, whose hymen is partially intact? Consequently, when the verse states that the priest becomes impure for his virgin sister, a grown woman is included. The Gemara answers: The derivation from the verse is necessary, as it might enter your mind that we should derive a verbal analogy from the word “virgin” in this context and the word “virgin” from there, the context of a High Priest: In the analogy, just as there the virgin referred to is a young woman and not a grown woman, so too here she must be a young woman. The verse therefore teaches us that a priest becomes impure for his sister even if she is a grown woman.

And Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon, what is their reason? They expound as follows: And for his virgin sister excludes a woman who was raped or seduced and a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally, who is also not considered a virgin. “Who has had no man” excludes a betrothed sister, although she is not yet fully married. “Who is near” is to include a betrothed woman who was then divorced, as she is once again near to her brother. “To him” is to include a grown woman. The Gemara asks: Can the term “who is near” come to include a betrothed woman who was divorced?

Didn’t Rabbi Shimon say: If she was fit for a High Priest, her brother must become impure for her, and if she was not fit for a High Priest, her brother may not become impure for her? A divorced woman is not fit for a High Priest even if she had been only betrothed before her divorce. The Gemara answers: It is different there, as the Merciful One includes her by the term: Who is near, which includes any sister who is close to him, even if she is unfit for a High Priest.
And what did you see – קְרוֹבָה Since the verses are not conclusive, it would seem logical that one who was betrothed and divorced is more distant from her brother and the rest of her father’s household than a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally (Ritva).

Female convert – גִּיּוֹרֶת The primary discussion of a female convert’s eligibility to marry a priest is in the final chapter of tractate Kiddushin. Some commentators maintain that female converts are forbidden to priests because they have the status of a zona, as implied later in the Gemara here. This appears to be the opinion of Rashi and the Rambam.

Others commentaries question this explanation: If the definition of a zona is one who has had forbidden intercourse, how can any tanna disagree with Rabbi Shimon and hold that one who converted when she was less than three years old is prohibited from marrying a priest? Even if someone would have had intercourse before she converted, intercourse with a girl less than three years old is not halakhically recognized as intercourse. Furthermore, even if she converted as an adult it is not clear that she would still be considered a zona afterward, as one who converts is considered to be starting a new life.

Consequently, these commentaries explain that the prohibition is based upon a command of the prophet Ezekiel, “Neither shall they take for their wives a widow…” but they shall take virgins of the seed of the house of Israel” (Ezekiel 44:22), as explained in tractate Kiddushin (78a).

The dispute among the tannaim is over which type of convert is included in this verse. According to this opinion, despite the fact that this mitzva does not appear in the Torah, it is not a mere injunction of a prophet. Rather, the prophet only indicated that a Torah law was in existence (Ra’avad; Rashba). The Ritva combines these opinions and explains that the verse in Ezekiel indicates that the category of zona includes not only one who has engaged in forbidden relations but also anyone who is not from the seed of the house of Israel (see Tosafot Tannim shei Shimo and Beit Shmuel). Later commentators attempt to prove from here that the prohibition for a priest to marry a convert is from Torah law, even if she converted when she was less than three years old.

A female convert less than…is permitted to the priesthood – הָתוֹרָה פְּחוּתָה This fact that this is cited here, in the context of a discussion of whom the High Priest may marry, indicates that according to Rabbi Shimon, this convert is permitted to marry even a High Priest. The Gemara’s proof from the story of Pinehas is consistent with this conclusion, as he was the priest anointed for war, and this priest has the same halakhot as a High Priest with regard to the prohibition against marrying a non-virgin (Koren Or).

A female convert less than three years and one day old – לִכְהוּנָּה פְּחוּתָה A priest may not marry a convert, even if she converted when she was less than three years old, as the halakha does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai. If he married her, he is forced to divorce her (Rambam Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bi’ah 18:3, Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 6:48).

The Gemara asks: And how do the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Shimon, interpret this verse? The Gemara responds: They understand the phrase “keep alive for yourselves” to mean that they could keep them as slaves and as maidservants, but they could not necessarily marry them. The Gemara asks: And if, if the source for Rabbi Shimon’s ruling is this verse, a girl who converted at the age of three years and one day old should also be permitted to a priest, as long as she has never had intercourse, as stated by the verse.

The Gemara asks: If so, a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally should also be included. The Gemara responds that the term: Who is near, which is written in the singular, includes only one additional case and not two. The Gemara asks: And what did you see to render forbidden a woman whose hymen was accidentally torn and permit a divorcée who had previously been betrothed, and not the opposite? The Gemara answers: In this case of the women whose hymen was torn, an action has been performed on her body, whereas in that case of the divorcée, no action has been performed on her body.

The baraita cites Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon as holding that a priest may not become impure for his sister who was betrothed and then divorced, and it cites only Rabbi Shimon as holding that he may not become impure for his sister who was a grown woman. Based on this, the Gemara asks: From the fact that Rabbi Yosei left his partner, Rabbi Shimon, it may be inferred that with regard to a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, that a priest does become impure. From where does he derive this halakha? The Gemara explains that he derives it from the phrase: “Who has had no man,” as a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally has not been with a man.

The Gemara asks: Haven’t you already derived the halakha of a betrothed woman from that phrase? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yosei learns one halakha from the phrase “has had no,” which indicates that she has not even been betrothed, and he derives one halakha from the term “man,” which indicates that only a woman who was with a man is no longer considered a virgin with regard to this halakha, but not one whose hymen was torn accidentally.

It was stated previously that according to Rabbi Shimon, the term “to him,” comes to include a grown woman. The Gemara asks: Didn’t Rabbi Shimon say with regard to a High Priest that the term virgin indicates a complete virgin, which does not include a grown woman? The Gemara answers: His reason is also derived from here, as he expounds as follows: From the fact that the expression “to him” is needed to include a grown woman, it may be inferred that the term virgin by itself indicates a complete virgin.

The Gemara cites another ruling of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai, also related to the discussion of defining who is considered a virgin. It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai says: A female convert who converted when she was less than three years and one day old is permitted to marry into the priesthood, as it is stated: “But all the women children that have not known man by their marriage, keep alive for yourselves” (Numbers 31:18). This verse indicates that these women were fit for all of the warriors, and since Pinehas the priest was with them (see Numbers 31:6), it is clear that young converts are permitted to priests.

The Gemara asks: And what did the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Shimon, interpret this verse? The Gemara responds: They understand the phrase “keep alive for yourselves” to mean that they could keep them as slaves and as maidservants, but they could not necessarily marry them. The Gemara asks: If so, if the source for Rabbi Shimon’s ruling is this verse, a girl who converted at the age of three years and one day old should also be permitted to a priest, as long as she has never had intercourse, as stated by the verse.

HALAKHA

A female convert less than three years and one day old – לִכְהוּנָּה פְּחוּתָה A priest may not marry a convert, even if she converted when she was less than three years old, as the halakha does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai. If he married her, he is forced to divorce her (Rambam Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bi’ah 18:3, Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 6:48).
Hidrokan – מין מחלת פיזיולוגית נפוצה dương בפרטים שונים, שהורונה על ידי אסכולה של מים במ暄ית, שמקנה תווית נפוצה. אסכולת המים נפוצה בברות ובנערות, ובמקרים מסוימים, גם אצל גברים. הסיבה ל beforeEachת המים במ暄ית הוא בעבורה של המעי או הדם. 

The Gemara replies: His reasoning is as stated by Rav Huna, as Rav Huna raised a contradiction: It is written in one verse: “Kill every woman that has known man by lying with him” (Numbers 31:17), which indicates that a woman who has not known a man in this way you may keep alive. This proves by inference that the female children, who are not classified as women, you may keep alive regardless of whether they knew a man or they did not know a man. And it is written in a different verse: “But all the women children that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves” (Numbers 31:18), which indicates that if they have known men, you must kill them. This is an apparent contradiction.

Rav Huna explains: You must say that the verse is speaking of a woman who is fit for intercourse. The verse does not mean to distinguish between women who have actually engaged in sexual intercourse and those who have not. Rather, it distinguishes between a girl over the age of three, with whom an act of intercourse is recognized as such, and a girl below the age of three.

This is also taught in a baraita: “Every woman that has known man”; the verse is speaking of a woman who is fit for intercourse. The baraita proceeds to discuss this halakha: Do you say it is referring to one who is fit for intercourse, or perhaps it is referring only to one who has actually had intercourse? When the verse states: “But all the women children that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves,” which indicates that grown women must be killed even if they have not had intercourse with a man, you must say that the verse is speaking of a woman who is fit for intercourse.

The Gemara asks a practical question with regard to the events described by the Torah: From where did they know whether a particular girl was already three years old and fit for intercourse? Rav Huna bar Bizna said that Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai: They passed them before the frontplate of the High Priest. Any girl whose face miraculously turned sallow, it was known that she was fit for intercourse, and any girl whose face did not turn sallow, it was thereby known that she was not fit for intercourse. Similarly, Rav Nahman said: A sign of transgression in the area of sexual morality is the disease hidrokan, which causes one’s face to turn sallow.

Similarly, you can say with regard to the verse: “And they found among the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead four hundred young virgins that had not known man by lying with him” (Judges 21:12). From where did they know that they were virgins? Rav Kahana said: They sat them on the opening of a barrel of wine. If she was a non-virgin, her breath would smell like wine; if she was a virgin, her breath did not smell like wine.

The Gemara suggests: They should have passed them before the frontplate, as described previously with regard to the daughters of Midian. Rav Kahana, son of Rav Natan, said: The verse states with regard to the frontplate: “And it shall be upon Aaron’s forehead…that they may be accepted before the Lord” (Exodus 28:38), which indicates that the frontplate is worn for acceptance but not for calamity. The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, the frontplate should also not have been used with regard to the women of Midian. Rav Ashi said: The word “they” is written in the verse, indicating that for them, the Jewish people, the frontplate is for acceptance but not for calamity; but for gentiles it can be used even for calamity.

Rabbi Ya’akov bar Ido said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai. Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Ya’akov bar Ido: Did you hear Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say this explicitly or did you learn it by inference?
The Gemara asks: What inference was Rabbi Zeira hinting at? The Gemara explains: As Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: There was a certain city in Eretz Yisrael where they contested the lineage of a particular family. And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi sent Rabbi Romanus, and he examined the family’s lineage and found that it included the daughter of a convert who had converted when she was less than three years and one day old, and she had married a priest. And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permitted her to the priesthood. This indicates that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi ruled in accordance with Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi said to him: I heard explicitly that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi ruled in this manner.

The Gemara asks: And if Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s opinion had been derived by inference, what of it? The Gemara answers: Perhaps it was different there, because since she had already married a priest, she could remain married after the fact, but it would not be permitted for her to marry a priest ab initio. As it is Rav and Rabbi Yohanan who both say: A High Priest may not marry a grown woman and a woman whose hymen was torn accidentally, but if he married one of them he is married and not required to divorce her.

The Gemara refutes this claim: How can these cases be compared? Granted, there, in the case of a grown woman, it is reasonable for her to be permitted after the fact, as a young woman will eventually be a grown woman under him, i.e., while married to him, and she will eventually be a non-virgin under him. However, here, in the case of a convert, will she eventually be a zona under him? If she is forbidden to a priest ab initio it is because she has the status of a zona, in which case she should be prohibited after the fact as well. Consequently, it can be proven from the incident cited previously that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon.

The Gemara comments: Rav Safra taught this halakha after deriving Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s ruling by inference, although he had never heard this ruling explicitly. And the question mentioned above was difficult for him, and he resolved it in this same manner.

The Gemara relates another incident related to this halakha: A certain priest married a convert, who had converted when she was less than three years and one day old. Rav Nahman bar Yitzchak said to him: What is this? Why are you violating the halakha? He said to him: It is permitted for me to marry her, as Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai. He said to him: Go remove her, i.e., divorce her. And if not, I will remove Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi from your ear [me'unehk] for you. In other words, I will take the necessary action to ensure that you obey and divorce her, so that you can no longer follow Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi’s opinion.

It is taught in a baraita: And similarly, Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai would say:

Where they contested the lineage, etc. – כְּרַבִּי: The Gemara indicates that a priest from that town married a woman who had converted when she was less than three years old. The Jerusalem Talmud offers an alternative account, in which the ruling follows the opinion of the Rabbis as well as that of Rabbi Shimon. According to that account, it was a regular Israelite who married the convert, and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permitted their descendants to marry priests.

From your ear [me’unehk] – רַבִּי רַבִּי: Unkei comes from the word un, a shortened form of unda, meaning ear. Some explain that he meant he would punish him until he removed the words of Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi, so that his ears would no longer listen to him. Others maintain that he claimed he would make him forget Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi until he would no longer mention his name (Arukh).

And similarly, Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai would say, etc. – כְּרַבִּי: What is the connection between the following statement and the previous discussion? Rabbi Shimon must have taught many other halakhot that are not cited here. The Rivan explains that the rabbis wanted to quote another case in which Rabbi Shimon ruled more leniently than the Rabbis. It is suggested in the Yarn shel Shlomo that this statement is cited here in order to emphasize that just as the halakha does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Shimon with regard to the previous discussion, it does not follow his opinion with regard to the upcoming discussion, although this is subject to a dispute between the early commentators. The Keren Ora and the Arukh LaTaia explain simply that these two halakhot are cited together because Rabbi Shimon derived both of them from verses with regard to the war against Midian.

NOTES