

ממולאי אמריתו מילי מוליתא? במקומה –  
מבשלה, שלא במקומה – לא מבשלה.

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: ניקב ונסתם,  
כל שאילו נקרי ונקרע פסול, ואי לא  
כשר. הוי בה רבא: היכא? אילימא למטה  
מעטרה – אפילו נברת נמי, אלא בעטרה  
עצמה. איתמר נמי, אמר רב מרי בר מר  
אמר מר עוקבא אמר שמואל: ניקב בעטרה  
עצמה ונסתם, כל שאילו נקרי ונקרע –  
פסול, ואי לא – כשר.

שלח ליה רבא בריה דרבה לרב יוסף:  
ילמדנו רבינו, היכי עבדינן? אמר ליה:  
מיתתין נהמא חמימא דשערי, ומנחין ליה  
אבי פוקרי, ומקרי ותוין ליה.

אמר אביי: אטו כולי עלמא יעקב אבינו  
הוא, דכתביב ביה "כחי וראשית אונ"י שלא  
רצה קרי מנימיו?

אלא אמר אביי: מעברין קמיה בגדי  
עבדונו, אמר רבא: אטו כולי עלמא ברזילי  
הגלעדי הוא? אלא, מתחורתא בדשני  
מעיקרא.

תנו רבנן: ניקב – פסול, מפני שהוא שותת.  
נסתם – כשר, מפני שהוא מוליד. וזהו פסול  
שחזור להכשירו. זהו – למעוטי מאי?  
למעוטי קרום שעלה מחמת מכה בריאה,  
דאינו קרום.

from truncated [*mimula'ei*] people,<sup>n</sup> as Rav Beivai's family traced their lineage to the house of Eli, all of whose descendants were destined to be short-lived (see 1 Samuel 2:31), you speak truncated [*mulayata*] and unsound matters. When the semen passes through its proper place, it fertilizes;<sup>h</sup> but if it does not pass through its proper place, it does not fertilize. Since he cannot father children, he is like one whose testicles have been crushed, and therefore he may not enter into the congregation.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: If a man's member had been punctured and it later healed and the hole closed up with flesh, in any case where, if he would emit semen, it would tear open again, he is unfit to enter into the congregation; but if not, he is fit. Rava discussed this ruling and raised a question: Where is this perforation? If we say it is below the corona, at the end of the man's member, why should this perforation render him unfit? Even if the member was entirely severed, he would also be fit. Rather, the hole is in the corona itself, that is, at the point where the corona meets the rest of the member.<sup>h</sup> It was also stated explicitly that this is the case, as Rav Mari bar Mar said that Mar Ukva said that Shmuel said: If a man's member had been punctured in the corona itself, and it later healed and the hole closed up with flesh, in any case where if he would emit semen it would tear open again, he is unfit; but if not, he is fit.

With regard to this issue, Rava, son of Rabba, sent the following question to Rav Yosef: Let our teacher teach us, what should we do to verify whether or not the perforation was adequately closed? Rav Yosef said to him: We bring warm barley bread and place it upon his anus [*bei pukrei*],<sup>l</sup> and owing to the heat he emits semen, and we observe what happens and see whether or not the perforation remains closed.

Abaye said: Is that to say that everyone is like our Patriarch Jacob, with regard to whom it is written: "Reuben, you are my firstborn, my might and the first fruits of my strength" (Genesis 49:3), implying that Jacob never experienced an emission of semen<sup>n</sup> in all his days, so that his eldest son Reuben was conceived from his first drop of seed, i.e., "the first fruits of my strength." The implication is that there is certainly no need for such measures in order to bring a man to ejaculate.

Rather, Abaye said that a different method is used: We pass before him colorful garments of a woman, and thereby bring him to arousal, so that he will experience an emission. Rava said: Is that to say that everyone is like Barzilai the Gileadite, traditionally known for his licentious character? Not all men are brought to excitement when they merely see such clothes. Rather, the Gemara rejects this proposal and states that it is clear as we initially answered, that we follow the former procedure even though not all men require it.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: If a man's member was punctured, he is unfit to enter into the congregation of Israel because his semen is discharged gently and does not fertilize; if the perforation later closed<sup>d</sup> up with flesh, he is fit, because now he can father children. And this is an instance of one who is unfit who returns to his previous state of fitness. The Gemara asks: What does the word this come to exclude? The Gemara explains that it comes to exclude a case involving an entirely different matter, that of a membrane that formed on the lung of an animal in the wake of a wound, which is not considered a proper membrane, as it is likely to rupture. If a puncture in the lung became covered with such a membrane the animal does not regain its former kosher status.

NOTES

Because you come from truncated [*mimula'ei*] people – משום דאתו ממולאי – The meaning of this expression, which appears in several places with regard to Rav Beivai bar Abaye, is not entirely clear. Rashi explains that *mula'ei* means wretched [*umlalim*], or cut off, as Rav Beivai descended from the house of Eli, whose descendants were condemned to premature death (see 1 Samuel 2:33). A slightly different interpretation is attributed to Rabbeinu Hananel (cited in *Tosafot*), who asserts that Rav Beivai's family came from the village of Mamla, whose residents were descendants of Eli. An alternative opinion is that *mula'ei* means important people who speak in a superior manner. In other words, since he comes from a distinguished family, Rav Beivai permits himself to speak haughtily, without examining his words carefully (*Arukh*).

He never experienced an emission of semen – שלא קרי – *Tosafot* understand that Reuben was born from the very first drop of semen that issued from Jacob's body. Rabbi Avraham min HaHar cites various proofs from the Bible that this was not necessarily the case. Rather, what this means here is that Jacob did not experience a nocturnal emission before marriage, and that Reuben was the product of his first relationship with Leah.

HALAKHA

In its place it fertilizes – במקומה מבשלה: If one's seminal tract becomes obstructed, and semen emerges from his urinary tract, he is disqualified from entering the congregation, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappi (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhhot Issurei Bia* 16:6; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 5:6).

If it had been punctured and it closed up – ניקב ונסתם: If one's member was punctured below the corona, i.e., at the end of the member, he is fit. If it was perforated on the corona itself, i.e., at the point where the corona meets the rest of the member, and semen emerges from this hole, he is disqualified. If the hole subsequently seals up he regains his fit status, in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhhot Issurei Bia* 16:5; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 5:4).

LANGUAGE

Anus [*bei pukrei*] – בני פוקרי: This word may mean the house or housing of the hole. Some explain *pukrei* as an abbreviation of two words, *pok re'i*, which means the place from where excrement exits.

BACKGROUND

Punctured and closed – ניקב ונסתם: A puncture in the penis that reaches the urethra may cause the sperm to exit in the wrong place and thereby render fertilization impossible. However, if such a puncture were sealed without having caused any permanent internal damage, the penis could return to its former functioning state.

BACKGROUND

We bring an ant – מִיִּיתֵינָן שׁוּמְשֵׁנָא: Using ants to heal wounds was widespread in different parts of the world, principally in central and east Africa. The ants would hold on to the sides of the wound when they were joined together, essentially serving the same purpose as modern stitches. The advantage of using ants was that it allowed one to avoid the insertion of metal needles into the body that could cause infection, enlarge the wound, and even worsen the injury. The species generally used for this was the army ant of the genus Dorylus, also known as driver ants. After the ant bites the skin its body is severed from its head, which is left behind to hold the wound closed.



Driver ant, with its large mandibles

LANGUAGE

Ant [shumshena] – שׁוּמְשֵׁנָא: The Arukh has a version of the text that reads shushmena, but other texts read shumshemana. There are parallels for both readings in Aramaic and Arabic, and all of them mean ant, or a particular species of ant.

Cause inflammation [zareif] – זָרִיף: Some understand this term here in its Aramaic sense as meaning to create a wound or a crack.

שָׁלַח לִיהָ רַב אִידִי בַר אַבִּין לְאַבְיֵי: הֵיכִי עֲבָדִינָּהּ? מִיִּיתֵינָן שְׁעָרְתָּא, וּמְסָרְטִינָן לִיהָ, וּמִיִּיתֵינָן תְּרַבָּא וְשׁוּיִפִּינָן, וּמִיִּיתֵינָן שׁוּמְשֵׁנָא גְמֻלָּא וּמְנַבְתִּינָן לִיהָ, וּפְסָקִינָן לִיהָ לְרִישֵׁיהָ. וְדוּקָא שְׁעָרְתָּא, אֲבָל פְּרוּלָּא – מְזַרְף זָרִיף. וְהֵינּוּ מִלֵּי – קָטָן, אֲבָל גְּדוּל – מִקְפּוּלֵי מִקְפָּל.

אָמַר רַבָּה בְּרַב הוֹנָא: הַמְטִיל מִים מִשְׁתֵּי מְקוֹמוֹת – פְּסוּל. אָמַר רַבָּא: לֵית הַלְכָתָּא לָא כְּבָרָא וְלָא כְּאָבָא. בְּרָא – הָא דְאָמְרוּ, אָבָא – דְאָמַר רַב הוֹנָא: נְשִׁים הַמְסוּלָּלוֹת זֹו בְּזוּ פְסוּלוֹת לְכַהוֹנָה.

וְאֶפִּילוּ לְרַבֵּי אֶלְעָזָר דְאָמַר פְּנוּי הָבֵא עַל הַפְּנוּיָה שְׁלֵא לְשֵׁם אִישׁוֹת עֲשָׂאָה זֹנָה, הֵינּוּ מִלֵּי אִישׁ, אֲבָל אִשָּׁה – פְּרִיצִיתָא בְּעֵלְמָא.

With regard to this issue, Rav Idi bar Avin sent the following question to Abaye: What should we do to expedite the healing of such a perforation? Abaye answered: We bring a sharp-edged grain of barley and lacerate the area around the hole with it. We then bring fat and rub it on the spot, and afterward we bring a large ant [shumshena]<sup>8L</sup> and let it bite inside the hole. This leads to bleeding and the formation of a scab, which eventually heals as new flesh grows there. We also cut off the ant's head so that it should remain in place until the wound is fully healed. The Gemara comments: And this procedure must be done specifically with a grain of barley, but an iron tool would cause inflammation [zareif].<sup>1</sup> The Gemara adds: And this applies only to a small perforation,<sup>N</sup> but a large one will eventually peel off and reopen.

Rabba bar Rav Huna said: One who passes water from two places, so that he appears to have a hole or some other blemish in his member, is unfit to enter into the congregation of Israel, as is a man with crushed testicles. Rava said: With regard to these matters, the halakha is in accordance neither with the opinion of the son nor with that of the father. The son, this refers to that opinion of Rabba bar Rav Huna, which we just stated. As for the ruling of the father, this is referring to that which Rav Huna said: Women who rub against one another<sup>NH</sup> motivated by sexual desire are unfit to marry into the priesthood, as such conduct renders a woman a zona, whom a priest is prohibited from marrying. It was about this that Rava said that the halakha is not in accordance with Rav Huna's opinion.

And even according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, who said that an unmarried man who has intercourse with an unmarried woman not for the sake of marriage renders her a zona, a woman who has had sexual relations with a man forbidden to her by the Torah, this applies only to intercourse with a man, but lewd behavior with another woman is mere licentiousness that does not render her a zona, and therefore she is still permitted to marry into the priesthood.

NOTES

And this applies only to a small perforation – וְהֵינּוּ מִלֵּי קָטָן: Most commentaries explain that a small perforation means one that has been fully sealed, whereas a large perforation refers to one that has not been properly closed. The wording of the She'iltot de Rav Aḥai Gaon indicates that he understood small and large as referring respectively to a minor and an adult: Since a minor does not emit semen his perforation is more likely to become completely sealed.

Women who rub against one another – נְשִׁים הַמְסוּלָּלוֹת: According to Rashi, the question is whether a woman who engages in such behavior is considered a zona and therefore

disqualified. The Ritva maintains that in the absence of intercourse the issue does not arise. Rather, the question here is whether such women are fit for a High Priest: If they lost their virginity in this manner, are they treated like a woman whose hymen was torn as the result of an injury or like one who engaged in intercourse? See the Ritva for his explanation of the continuation of the passage in the Gemara, as he claims that Rabbi Elazar's view was cited not as a proof with regard to the matter itself, but in order to demonstrate that even Rabbi Elazar, who is stringent with regard to cohabitation, does not render one unfit if there was no act of intercourse.

HALAKHA

Women who rub against one another – נְשִׁים הַמְסוּלָּלוֹת: Women who rub against one another motivated by sexual desire transgress the prohibition against following the conduct of Egypt, and it is appropriate for them to receive lashes for rebelliousness administered by rabbinic decree. Men must

take precautions to prevent their wives from engaging in such behavior. However, such conduct does not render a woman forbidden to her husband, nor does it disqualify her from marrying into the priesthood (Rambam Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhhot Issurei Bia 21:8; Shulḥan Arukh, Even HaEzer 20:2).

A man with crushed testicles is prohibited from entering into the congregation – פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא אָסוּר בְּקַהֲלָא – It is prohibited for a man with crushed testicles or a severed penis to marry a woman who was born Jewish, but it is permitted for him to marry a convert or an emancipated maidservant (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 16:1; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 5:1).

A priest with crushed testicles – פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא כֹהֵן – It is permitted for a priest with crushed testicles to marry a convert or an emancipated maidservant, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Sheshet and the second version of Rava's opinion (see Beit Shmuel; Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 16:1; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 5:1).

It is permitted for a man with crushed testicles to marry a Gibeonite woman – פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא מוֹתֵר בְּנִתְיָנָה – It is permitted for a man with crushed testicles to marry a Gibeonite woman or a woman of uncertain lineage, e.g., one whose father's identity is not known, or a foundling, or the like, in accordance with the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 16:1–2; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 5:1).

מתני' פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא וְכֹרֹת שְׁפָכָה מוֹתֵרִין בְּגִיּוֹרָתָא וּמְשׁוּחָרְרָתָא, וְאֵינְן אָסוּרִין אֲלָא מִלְּבָא בְּקַהֲלָא, שְׁנַאֲמַר "לֹא יָבֵא יְפָעוּעַ דְּכָא וְכֹרֹת שְׁפָכָה בְּקַהֲלָא הָ" .

**MISHNA** A man with crushed testicles or with other wounds to his genitals and one whose penis has been severed are permitted to marry a female convert or an emancipated maidservant, and they are prohibited only from entering into the congregation and marrying a woman who was born Jewish,<sup>14</sup> as it is stated: "A man wounded with crushed testicles or a severed penis shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (Deuteronomy 23:2).

גמ' בְּעוּ מִיָּנִיָּה מִרַב שִׁשְׁתַּי: פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא כֹהֵן, מַהוּ בְּגִיּוֹרָתָא וּמְשׁוּחָרְרָתָא? בְּקִדּוּשְׁתֵּיהּ קָאֵי, וְאֵסוּר, אִוּ דְּלִמָּא לֹא בְּקִדּוּשְׁתֵּיהּ קָאֵי, וְשָׂרִי?

**GEMARA** They raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the *halakha* governing a priest with crushed testicles<sup>NH</sup> with respect to a female convert or an emancipated maidservant? The Gemara clarifies the two sides of this dilemma: Does he retain his state of sanctity like any other priest and is therefore prohibited from marrying either one of these women, or perhaps he does not retain his state of sanctity and therefore is permitted to marry a convert, like an ordinary Israelite with crushed testicles?

אָמַר רַבָּא לְהוּ רַב שִׁשְׁתַּי: תְּנִיתוּהּ, פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא יִשְׂרָאֵל מוֹתֵר בְּנִתְיָנָה, וְאִי סְלִיקָא דְּעֵתְךָ בְּקִדּוּשְׁתֵּיהּ קָאֵי – אֲקָרִי בָּאן לֹא תִתְחַתֵּן בִּסְמִי!

Rav Sheshet said to them: You already learned the answer to this question in the following *baraita*: It is permitted for an ordinary Israelite with crushed testicles to marry a Gibeonite woman.<sup>NH</sup> Now, if it enters your mind that he retains his sanctity as a Jew, one should apply here the prohibition stated with regard to Canaanites: "You shall not marry them" (Deuteronomy 7:3). Apparently, then, one whose testicles have been crushed loses his former sanctity, and the same should apply to a priest.

אָמַר רַבָּא: אֵטוּ הָתָם מִשּׁוּם קִדּוּשָׁה וְלֹא קִדּוּשָׁה הוּא? דְּלִמָּא מוֹלִיד בֵּן וְאִוּל פֶּלֶח לְעִבּוּדָה זָרָה, וְהֵינּי מִיָּלִי – בְּגִיּוֹרָתוֹ, כִּי מִגִּיּוֹרֵי – בִּישְׂרָאֵל שָׂרוּ, וְרַבְּנָן הוּא דְּגִּוְרוּ בְּהוּ, וְכִי גִּוְרוּ בְּהוּ רַבְּנָן – בְּהֵנָּךְ דְּבִינֵי אוֹלוּדֵי, אֲבָל הָאֵי דְּלֹא בְּרֵי אוֹלוּדֵי לֹא גִּוְרוּ בֵּיהּ רַבְּנָן.

Rava said: This is no proof, as is that to say that the prohibition there against marrying Canaanites is due to sanctity or lack of sanctity? Rather, the reason for the prohibition is that perhaps one will father a child from his Canaanite wife and that child will later go off and engage in idolatrous worship. Now, this concern applies only when they are still gentiles, but when they convert, as did the Gibeonites, they are permitted to Jews. And it is the Sages who decreed that Gibeonites are forbidden like *mamzerim* even after their conversion. And when the Sages decreed that one may not marry them, the decree was limited to those who are capable of having children, but with regard to this one, a man with crushed testicles who is incapable of having children, the Sages did not issue a decree.

NOTES

A priest with crushed testicles – פְּצוּעַ דְּכָא כֹהֵן – This problem is also addressed in the Jerusalem Talmud, which cites a dispute with regard to this very issue. It appears that according to the opinion that a priest with crushed testicles is forbidden to women who are unfit for the priesthood, an ordinary Israelite with crushed testicles is forbidden to a *mamzeret*. The Gemara there differentiates between physical disqualifications and other types of marriage disqualifications. Those who are forbidden in marriage for other reasons are permitted to all disqualified women, but those with physical disabilities are not. This opinion is similar to that of the Rambam, who maintains that a man with crushed testicles is permitted only to those who are disqualified due to uncertainty, e.g., a child whose father's identity is not known, or a foundling, and to those who are forbidden by rabbinic decree, e.g., a Gibeonite woman. However, he may not marry a woman who is prohibited by Torah law to enter into the congregation. Others claim that in this regard there is no difference between women forbidden by the Sages and those forbidden by the Torah. Rather, all

disqualified women are permitted to a man with crushed testicles. According to this opinion, a priest whose testicles have been crushed lacks the sanctity of the priesthood altogether, to the extent that he is not even barred from contracting ritual impurity imparted by a corpse.

The prohibition against marrying Gibeonites – אִיסוּר נְתִינִים – According to the Rambam and others, gentiles from the seven Canaanite nations who converted are in principle permitted to marry Jews, as the biblical prohibition stated in their regard applies only while they are gentiles. However, owing to ancient decrees of Moses, Joshua, and David, each with its own degree of severity, members of these nations are disqualified from entering into the congregation. On the other hand, many authorities maintain that the biblical prohibition against marrying them applies specifically after they have converted, which means they are forbidden by Torah law, like all others disqualified from entering into the congregation (see Ritva).



NOTES

*Mamzerim* and Gibeonites are permitted – מְמֻזְרִים וְגִבְעוֹנִים: Why is this teaching necessary? It is permitted for a *mamzer* to marry any woman who is disqualified from the congregation; what, then, is special about a Gibeonite woman? The *Hazon Ish* suggests that since he is certainly prohibited from marrying a Gibeonite woman before she converts, as he retains the sanctity of a Jew even though he is disqualified from entering the congregation, one might have thought that the Sages decreed that he may not marry her even after her conversion.

HALAKHA

*Mamzerim* and Gibeonites are permitted to marry one another – מְמֻזְרִים וְגִבְעוֹנִים מִתְּרִים לְבֵּא זֶה בָּזֶה – It is permitted for *mamzerim* and Gibeonites to marry each other. The child born from such a union has the status of a *mamzer* (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 15:33).

When they are gentiles there can be no valid marriage with them – בְּגוֹיֹתָן לֵית לָהּ חֲתָנוּת: By Torah law, a convert from one of the seven Canaanite nations may enter the congregation. It is known, however, that of them only the Gibeonites converted, and that Joshua decreed that they may not marry Israelites. The Ramban, Rashba, and *Tur* maintain that Gibeonites are forbidden by Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:22).

They did not accept converts in the days of David, etc. – לֹא – קִבְּלוּ גֵרִים בְּיָמֵי דָוִד וְכוּ: During the reigns of David and Solomon the courts did not accept converts out of concern that the prospective converts were driven by impure motives. As for those who converted in the presence of ordinary people, the High Court was skeptical about their conversions. They did not reject these individuals, in case they were proper converts, but neither did they draw converts near until they observed their behavior over the course of time (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 13:15).

אֵלֶּיךָ מֵעַתָּה, מִמִּזְרֵי דְבַר אֱלֹהִים – הֲכֵי נִמְי דְאִסְרִי? וְהָאֵתְנָן: מִמְּזוּרִים וְגִבְעוֹנִים מִתְּרִים לְבֵּא זֶה בָּזֶה! אֵלֶּיךָ: כִּי גִזְרֵי רַבָּנָן – בְּכַשְׁרֵיהֶם, בְּכַפְסוּלֵיהֶם לֹא גִזְרֵי רַבָּנָן.

הַדֵּר אָמַר רַבָּא: לֹא מִילְתָּא הִיא, בְּגוֹיֹתָן לֵית לָהּ חֲתָנוּת, נִתְּגַיְרוּ – אֵית לָהּ חֲתָנוּת.

מִתֵּיב רַב יוֹסֵף: "וַיִּתְחַתֵּן שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת בֵּת פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם! גִּיּוּרֵי גֵיּוּרָה. וְהָאֵל לֹא קִבְּלוּ גֵרִים לֹא בְּיָמֵי דָוִד וְלֹא בְּיָמֵי שְׁלֹמֹה! מִיָּדִי הוּא טַעֲמָא – אֵלֶּיךָ לְשׁוּלְחָן מְלָכִים,

The Gemara raises an objection against Rava: **However, if that is so, then with regard to a *mamzer*, who is capable of having children, so too one would say that he is prohibited from marrying a Gibeonite. But didn't we learn otherwise in a mishna (*Kiddushin* 69a): *Mamzerim and Gibeonites are permitted<sup>n</sup> to marry one another.*<sup>h</sup> Rather, retract this explanation and replace it with the following: **When the Sages decreed that one may not marry a Gibeonite, they limited their decree to those who are fit, so as to prevent them from mingling with Gibeonites; but with regard to those who are unfit to enter into the congregation, the Sages did not issue a decree.****

Rava then reconsidered and said that what he had previously argued, that the prohibition against marrying them applies only when they are gentiles, **is not correct.** The prohibition cannot be referring to gentiles, as **when they are gentiles there can be no valid marriage with them<sup>h</sup>** at all. It is only after **they have converted that there can be valid marriage with them**, and therefore the prohibition against entering into marriage with them applies. Nevertheless, it is permitted for a man with crushed testicles to marry a Gibeonite woman.

Rav Yosef raised an objection from the verse that states: **"And Solomon married the daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt"** (1 Kings 3:1), which indicates that there can, in fact, be valid marriage even with gentiles. The Gemara answers: Before Solomon took Pharaoh's daughter as his wife, **he converted her.** The Gemara asks: **But isn't it so that they did not accept converts, neither in the days of David<sup>h</sup> nor in the days of Solomon?** The Gemara answers: **But isn't the reason that they did not accept converts during those periods only due to concern that the converts were not acting for the sake of Heaven but in fact desired the power of the table of kings, David and Solomon?**

Perek VIII  
Daf 76 Amud b

הָאֵל לֹא צְרִיכָא לֵיהּ.

But **this one**, Pharaoh's daughter, **did not require such things**, as she herself was the daughter of royalty, and therefore there would have been no reason to doubt the sincerity of her conversion.

[וַיִּתְּפוּק לֵיהּ] דְּהָא מִצְרִית רֵאשׁוֹנָה הִיא! וְכִי טַעֲמָא: הֲנֵךְ אֲזִילִי לְעֵלְמָא וְהֵנִי אַחֲרֵינִי נִנְהוּ –

The Gemara asks: **But let him derive that Pharaoh's daughter was forbidden to Solomon for a different reason, as she was a first-generation Egyptian convert.** Even if she converted, she would still have been an Egyptian convert of the first generation, and as such neither she nor her children would have been permitted to marry a Jew by birth (Deuteronomy 23:8–9). **And if you would say that those whom the Torah rendered forbidden have already left Egypt and are now living elsewhere in the world,<sup>n</sup> and those currently living in Egypt are others, there is a difficulty.**

NOTES

Those have left and are living elsewhere in the world – הֲנֵךְ – אֲזִילִי לְעֵלְמָא: Rashi explains that all of the Egyptians forbidden by Torah law drowned in the Red Sea. Other early authorities are puzzled by his opinion, as it appears that only some of the Egyptian military drowned, not the entire population. The Ritva suggests that perhaps Rashi means that after the Egyp-

tians were reduced in number as a result of the plagues they suffered in Egypt and at the Red Sea, many members of other nations entered their country and intermingled with them. The Rashba and most commentaries understand the passage in its plain sense: Over the years other nations came to Egypt while the original Egyptians departed for other lands.

**Minyamin** – **מִינְיָמִין**: This name appears already in the Bible (II Chronicles 31:15). However, as it was used in the time of the Mishna and later, both in this form and in Aramaic, Manyumei, the name seems to be a variant of the name Benyamin, with the *beit* being replaced by a *mem*, a phenomenon found in several first names over the generations.

## NOTES

**Minyamin, an Egyptian convert** – **מִינְיָמִין גַּר מִצְרַיִם**: Many commentaries, from *Tosafot* to the later authorities, deal with the issue of Egyptian converts nowadays. The Gemara here indicates that Egyptians remain forbidden. This is the case even though the Sages ruled elsewhere in regard to other nations, such as Ammon and Moab, that Sennacherib came and mixed up the nations and therefore the present inhabitants of those lands are not the descendants of those who were living there in the time of Moses. This question is clearly the subject of a tannaitic dispute. Conflicting sources are also recorded in the *Tosefta*. According to one source, Egyptians are still forbidden, either because Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar did not mix up the entire country and only exiled a minority of its residents, or because there is an explicit guarantee in the Bible, with reference to time and place, that God will restore them to their land (see Ramban, Rashba, and Rabbeinu Tam's *Sefer HaYashar*). On the other hand, the Rambam and many others maintain that all the nations were mingled together. Therefore, nowadays all of the special prohibitions applying to specific nations are no longer in force (see Meiri).

But “and he married” is difficult – **אֵלֶּיָא קִשְׁיָא וַיִּתְחַתֵּן**: The early authorities understand Rashi's presentation and resolution of the problem as follows: Since she was an Egyptian convert, how can their relationship be described as marriage? Some object that although the marriage is forbidden, it is nevertheless valid. Consequently, they explain that if the previous claim that Solomon only “cleaved in love” to his foreign wives is accepted, and there was no marriage at all, why does the verse use the phrase “and he married”? (Ramban; Rashba).

## HALAKHA

**The prohibition proscribing an Ammonite and Moabite** – **אִיסוּר עַמּוּנִי וּמוֹאָבִי**: It is prohibited for male Ammonite and Moabite converts to enter into the congregation for all generations. However, female Ammonites and Moabites who converted are permitted. Nowadays, it is permitted for even male Ammonite and Moabite converts to marry Jewish women, as the ancient Ammonites and Moabites have become intermingled with other nations (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:18; *Shulḥan Arukh*, *Even HaEzer* 4:2, 7).

**An Egyptian and an Edomite** – **מִצְרַיִם וְאֶדוּמִי**: It is prohibited for Egyptian and Edomite converts to enter into the congregation until the third generation. This prohibition applies to both males and females, in accordance with the unattributed view in the mishna. Nowadays Edomites are permitted, as the ancient Edomites have become intermingled with other nations. As for Egyptian converts, some authorities (Rosh) rule that they are forbidden, whereas others (Rambam; *Bah*) permit them, based on the assumption that the ancient Egyptians have also become intermingled with other nations (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:19; *Shulḥan Arukh*, *Even HaEzer* 4:3, 7).

וְהָא תַּנְיָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: מִנְיָמִין גַּר מִצְרַיִם הָיָה לִי חֵבֶר מִתְלַמְּדֵי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא. אָמַר: אֲנִי מִצְרַיִם רַאשׁוֹן, וְנִשְׂאֵתִי מִצְרַיִת רַאשׁוֹנָה. אֲשִׁיא לְבִנִי מִצְרַיִת שְׁנִיָּה, בְּדִי שְׂיֵהָא בֶן בְּנֵי רַאשׁוֹן לְבָא בְּקַהֲלָא.

As, isn't it taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda said: Minyamin,<sup>L</sup> an Egyptian convert,<sup>N</sup> was a friend of mine from among the students of Rabbi Akiva, and he said: After I converted I was a first-generation Egyptian convert, and so I married another first-generation Egyptian convert. I will marry off my son, who is a second-generation Egyptian convert, to another second-generation Egyptian convert, so that my grandson will be fit to enter into the congregation. This indicates that first- and second-generation converts of Egyptian extraction were prohibited from entering into the congregation even during the period of the Mishna.

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: אֲנִן מִשְׁלֵמָה לִיקוּ וְנִתְיָב? שְׁלֵמָה לֹא נָסִיב מִיָּדִי דְּכִתִּיב בֵּיהּ “מִן הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר אָמַר ה' אֵל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא תָבֹאוּ בָּהֶם וְהֵם לֹא יָבֹאוּ בְּכֶם אֲכַן יִשׁוּ אֶת לְבַבְכֶם אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם בְּהֶם דְּבַק שְׁלֵמָה לְאַהֲבָהּ. אֵלֶּיָא קִשְׁיָא וַיִּתְחַתֵּן!

Rav Pappa said: Shall we stand up and raise an objection from Solomon? Solomon did not marry anyone, as it is written in his regard: “Of the nations concerning which the Lord said to the children of Israel, You shall not go among them, neither shall they come among you; for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods; Solomon cleaved to these in love” (1 Kings 11:2). Solomon cleaved to these women in love, but was not legally married to them. As Solomon had other forbidden wives, the case of Pharaoh's daughter presents no special difficulty. In fact, none of these marriages were valid at all. But the phrase “and Solomon married” (1 Kings 3:1) that appears in connection with Pharaoh's daughter is difficult,<sup>N</sup> as it indicates that this marriage was in fact valid.

מִתּוֹךְ אַהֲבָה יִתְרָה שְׂאֵהָבָה מַעֲלָה עָלָיו הִכְתוּב כְּאִילוּ נִתְחַתֵּן בֵּיהּ.

The Gemara answers: Due to the extraordinary love that he had for her, the verse relates to him as if he had married her through a legally valid marriage, even though this was not the case.

אָמַר לִיָּה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אֲשִׁי: וְהָא אֲנִן תַּנְיָא פְּצוּעַ דְּבָא וְכַרוּת שְׁפִכָּה – מוֹתָרִים בְּגִיזְרֵת וּמְשׁוּחָרְרֵת, הָא בְּנִתְיָבָה אֲסִירִי!

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: But didn't we learn in the mishna that a man with crushed testicles and one whose penis has been severed are permitted to marry a female convert and an emancipated maidservant? That indicates that it is only these women whom they are permitted to marry, but they are prohibited from marrying a Gibeonite woman. This appears to contradict the *baraita* that permits a man with crushed testicles to marry a Gibeonite.

אָמַר לִיָּה: וְלִיטְעָמִיךְ, אִימָא סִיפָא: וְאִינְן אֲסִירִין אֵלֶּיָא מִלְּבָא בְּקַהֲלָא הָא בְּנִתְיָבָה – שׁוּרִי: אֵלֶּיָא, מִדָּה לִיבָא לְמִשְׁמַע מִינָהּ.

Rav Ashi said to Ravina: And according to your line of reasoning, say the latter clause of the mishna as follows: And they are prohibited only from entering into the congregation, and infer just the opposite, that it is only a woman who was born Jewish whom they are prohibited from marrying, but they are permitted to marry a Gibeonite woman, as she is not part of the congregation of the Lord. Rather, no inference is to be learned from this mishna, as the possible inferences are contradictory, and one must therefore rely on the *halakha* that was expressly taught.

**מתני'** עַמּוּנִי וּמוֹאָבִי אֲסוּרִים, וְאִיסוּרֵן אִיסוּר עוֹלָם, אֲבָל נִקְבוּתֵיהֶם מוֹתָרֵת מִיָּד.

**MISHNA** Ammonite and Moabite converts are prohibited from entering into the congregation and marrying a woman who was born Jewish, and their prohibition is eternal, for all generations. However, their female counterparts, even the convert herself, are permitted immediately.<sup>H</sup>

מִצְרַיִם וְאֶדוּמִי אִינְן אֲסוּרִים אֵלֶּיָא עַד שְׁלֹשָׁה דּוֹרוֹת, אַחַד זָכָרִים וְאַחַד נְקִיבוֹת. רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן מְתִיר אֶת הַנְּקִיבוֹת מִיָּד. אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן: קָל יְחֻזְמֵר הַדְּבָרִים: וּמָה אִם בְּמִקּוֹם שְׂאֵסֵר אֶת הַזָּכָרִים אִיסוּר עוֹלָם – הִתִּיר אֶת הַנְּקִיבוֹת מִיָּד, מִקּוֹם שְׂלֵא אֲסִיר אֶת הַזָּכָרִים אֵלֶּיָא עַד שְׁלֹשָׁה דּוֹרוֹת – אִינְן דִּין שְׁנִיתִיר אֶת הַנְּקִיבוֹת מִיָּד?

Egyptian and Edomite converts are prohibited from entering into the congregation only for three generations, both males and females.<sup>H</sup> Rabbi Shimon renders permitted Egyptian and Edomite females immediately. Rabbi Shimon said: The matter may be derived by way of an *a fortiori* inference: If in a place where the Torah rendered prohibited the males with an eternal prohibition, i.e., Ammonites and Moabites, it rendered permitted the females immediately, then in a place where it rendered prohibited the males for only three generations, i.e., Egyptians and Edomites, is it not right that we should render permitted the females immediately?

LANGUAGE

Multitudes [ukhlusa] – אוכלוסא: This word derives from the Greek ὄχλος, okhlos, meaning throng or large crowd of followers.

BACKGROUND

Does he come from Perez or does he come from Zerah – אי מפרץ אתי אי מזרח אתי: Perez and Zerah were twin brothers who were born to Tamar following her liaison with Judah (see Genesis, chapter 38). According to Jacob's blessings to his children (Genesis 48:8–12), the Jewish people's monarchy was destined to be established from the descendants of Judah, and they therefore posed a threat to Saul's continued rule.

HALAKHA

A king may breach a way – המלך פורץ לעשות דרך: A king may breach a fence to make a road for himself, and none may object. The road may be made as wide as is necessary. The king need not divert its course due to an individual's field or vineyard; rather, he may proceed in a straight line in order to wage his war (Rambam Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhot Melakhim 5:3).

NOTES

And Saul clad David – וילבש שאול את דוד: Saul knew that he was clearly taller than everyone else. Why, then, did he even attempt to dress David in his own apparel? The Yefe Toar answers that although he did not expect his clothes to fit David, he wished to perform a symbolic act in order to honor him and strengthen his resolve.

It is written: A mamzer – ממזר בתיב: The Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot explains that had the verse said mamzir, one might have interpreted it as referring specifically to males, but the word "mamzer" signifies an impairment of some sort that can apply to both males and females. As the She'iltot deRav Aḥai Gaon says, it is as though the verse said mimzar, or, in the words of Rabbeinu Avraham min HaHar: One who has this blemish [mum] is an alien [zar].

אָמרו לוֹ: אִם הִלְכָה – נִקְבַּל, וְאִם לְדוּן – יֵשׁ תְּשׁוּבָה, אָמַר לָהֶם: לֹא כִּי הִלְכָה אֲנִי אוֹמֵר.

גַּמְ' מִנָּא הֲנִי מִלִּי? אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: דְּאָמַר קָרָא "וְכִרְאוֹת שְׂאוּל אֶת דָּוִד יוֹצֵא לְקִרְיַת הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי אֲמַר אֶל אַבְנֵר שֶׁר הֶעֱבָא בֶן מִן זֶה הַנַּעַר, אַבְנֵר, וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְנֵר חֵי נַפְשֶׁךָ הַמֶּלֶךְ אִם יִדְעָתִי." וְלֹא יָדַע לִי? וְהִכְתִּיב "וַיֵּאָהֱבוּ מֵאִדּוּ וַיְהִי לוֹ נוֹשֵׂא כְלִים!" אֶלְא: אֵאָבוּהָ קָא מְשָׁאִיל.

וְאָבִיו לֹא יָדַע לִי? וְהִכְתִּיב "וְהָאִישׁ בְּיָמָיו שְׂאוּל זָקֵן בָּא בְּאַנְשִׁים." וְאָמַר רַב וַיִּתִּימָא רַבִּי אַבָּא: זֶה יֵשׁוּ אָבִי דָּוִד שְׁנַכְנַם בְּאוּכְלוּסָא וַיֵּצֵא בְּאוּכְלוּסָא!

הֲכִי קָאָמַר שְׂאוּל: אִי מִפְּרֵץ אֲתִי, אִי מִזְרַח אֲתִי? אִי מִפְּרֵץ אֲתִי – מִלְּבָא הוּי, שְׁהַמֶּלֶךְ פּוֹרֵץ לַעֲשׂוֹת דְּרֵךְ וְאִין מִמְחִין בְּדוּד, אִי מִזְרַח אֲתִי – חֲשִׁיבָא בְּעֵלְמָא הוּי.

מֵאִי טַעְמָא אָמַר לִי שְׂאוּל עֲלִיָּה? דְּכָתִיב "וַיִּלְבַּשׂ שְׂאוּל אֶת דָּוִד מִדְּוִי" – כְּמִדְּתוֹ, וְכָתִיב בֵּיהּ בְּשְׂאוּל "מִשְׁכְּמוֹ וּמִעֲלָה גְבוּהַ מִכָּל הָעָם." אָמַר לִי דוֹאֵג הָאֲדוּמִי: עַד שְׂאֲתָה מְשָׁאִיל עֲלָיו אִם הֲגוֹן הוּא לְמַלְכוּת אִם לֹא, שְׂאוּל עֲלָיו אִם רָאוּי לְבָא בְּקַהֲל אִם לֹא. מֵאִי טַעְמָא – דְּקָאָתִי מְרוּת הַמּוֹאֲבִיָּה.

אָמַר לִי אַבְנֵר: תִּנְיָנָא, "עֲמוּזָנִי" וְלֹא עֲמוּזָנִית "מוֹאֲבִי" וְלֹא מוֹאֲבִית. אֶלְא מֵעֵתָה "מִמְזוֹר" וְלֹא מִמְזוֹרִית! "מִמְזוֹר" בְּתִיב, מוּם זָר.

Rabbi Shimon's colleagues said to him: If you are reporting a halakha that you received from your teachers, we will accept it from you. But if you merely wish to prove your case with an a fortiori inference based on your own reasoning, there is a refutation of your argument. Rabbi Shimon said to them: That is not so. I disagree with your claim that the a fortiori inference can be refuted, but in any case I am stating a halakha handed down to me by my teachers.

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived that female Ammonites and Moabites are permitted immediately? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: As the verse states: "And when Saul saw David go forth against the Philistine, he said to Abner, the captain of the host: Abner, whose son is this youth? And Abner said: As your soul lives, O king, I cannot tell" (1 Samuel 17:55). This verse is puzzling: Did Saul really not recognize him? But isn't it previously written: "And David came to Saul, and stood before him; and he loved him greatly; and he became his armor-bearer" (1 Samuel 16:21)? Rather, it must be that he was asking about David's father.

The Gemara is still puzzled by this verse: And did Saul not recognize David's father? But isn't it written with regard to Jesse, David's father: "And the man in the days of Saul was old, and came among men" (1 Samuel 17:12), and Rav, and some say Rabbi Abba, said: This is referring to Jesse, father of David, who always entered with multitudes [ukhlusa]<sup>1</sup> and left with multitudes. As he was clearly a man of importance, everyone must have known who he was.

Rather, this is what Saul was saying, in his attempt to clarify David's lineage: Does he come from the descendants of Perez, or does he come from the descendants of Zerah?<sup>8</sup> What is the significance of this question? If he comes from Perez he will be king, as a king may breach [poretz] a way<sup>9</sup> for himself and no one can stop him. And if he comes from Zerah he will be merely a man of importance, but not a king.

The Gemara continues with its explanation: For what reason did Saul say to Abner that he should inquire about David? As it is written: "And Saul clad David<sup>n</sup> with his apparel [maddav]" (1 Samuel 17:38), which indicates that the clothes were of David's size [kemiddato]. And it is written with regard to Saul: "From his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people" (1 Samuel 9:2). Upon seeing that his clothes fit David, Saul began to fear that it might be David who was destined for the throne, and he therefore inquired into his background. At that point, Doeg the Edomite said to Saul: Before you inquire as to whether or not he is fit for kingship, inquire as to whether or not he is even fit to enter into the congregation. What is the reason for such doubts? It is that he descends from Ruth the Moabite, and Moabites are permanently barred from entering the congregation.

Abner said to him: We already learned that there is no room for such concern. As the verse states: "An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (Deuteronomy 23:4), teaching that an Ammonite man is barred from entering into the congregation, but not an Ammonite woman; and similarly, a Moabite man is barred from entering into the congregation, but not a Moabite woman. Doeg said to him: However, if that is so, say that the verse that renders it prohibited for a mamzer to enter the congregation renders prohibited only a male mamzer, but not a female mamzer. Abner replied: It is written: "A mamzer,"<sup>m</sup> which should be understood not as a noun but as an adjective, denoting a strange blemish [mum zar], one who is defective due to a forbidden relationship, and this applies to males and females alike.



