Doeg retorted: If so, say that it is prohibited for only an Egyptian man to enter into the congregation, but not an Egyptian woman. Abner answered: Here it is different, as the reason for the prohibition recorded in this verse with regard to Ammonites is explicit: “Because they did not meet you with bread and with water on the way, when you came forth out of Egypt” (Deuteronomy 23:3). Since it is the way of a man to go forth to meet guests but it is not the way of a woman to go forth, females were not included in this prohibition. Doeg countered: Still, the men should have gone forth to meet the men, and the women to meet the women. Abner was silent, as he did not know how to respond to this objection.

Immediately: “And the king said, inquire you whose son is this lad” (1 Samuel 17:56). The Gemara comments: There, in the previous verse, Saul calls him youth [na’ar], and here he calls him lad [elam]. This change in the wording hints at the following discussion. Saul said to Doeg as follows: The halakha is hidden [nitalma] from you, and you are ignorant of the law. Go and inquire about the matter in the study hall. He went to the study hall and asked. They said to him: The halakha is: An Ammonite man is forbidden, but not an Ammonite woman; a Moabite man is forbidden, but not a Moabite woman.

NOTES

He girded his sword like Ishmael – לְכָּל עֲמָרֹן׃ The Maharsha raises the following difficulty, citing the Yefe Toar: Why is girding a sword connected here to Ishmael? After all, the sword was traditionally associated with Esau. Several answers have been suggested (see Ralf). According to one suggestion, Ishmael is mentioned here because it says about him: “His hand will be against all, and the hand of all against him” (Genesis 16:12), and Amasa maintained his opinion in opposition to all his peers (Ezra 16:12). The Arukh Lahar explains that the reference is to Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, who girded his sword and killed Gedaliah (see Jeremiah 40:41).

With regard to the incident itself, while it is generally prohibited to bring weapons into the study hall, there were times when this rule was disregarded in order to affirm and establish a particular halakha (see Gilyon HaShas). Every Torah scholar who issues a halakhic ruling – הלכה לכה בדיאון הלכה: Rabbeinu Tam explains that this does not refer to all scholars who issue practical rulings but only to those who are personally involved, as their testimony might be compromised. Most early authorities accept this opinion, as it is stated in the Jerusalem Talmud in tractate Sanhedrin that the reference is in fact to a case of this kind. However, some commentators maintain that any novel ruling in a practical case is suspect because the scholar in question is personally involved, as he seeks to verify his own ruling. Rabbeinu Arnahin min Hazrat attributes this interpretation to Rashi (see Meir).

Samuel and his court were still living – וַעֲלָם שָׁם מְלָכִי: According to Rashi, there is no concern that one might be lying about a matter that can easily be verified. The Riva states that one does not suspect a Torah scholar of outright falsehood; the only concern is that in his attempt to establish his own opinion, he might report a ruling that he thinks he heard from his teacher when he did not actually do so. However, when his teacher is still alive, it is assumed that his report will be precise.

HALAKHA

A scholar who issues a halakhic ruling – הלכה לכה בדיאון הלכה: With regard to a scholar who issues a halakhic ruling that has practical ramifications for himself, if he had already stated the halakha before the personal incident arose, his ruling is accepted; but if not, the ruling is not accepted (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De‘a 242:36, and in the comment of Rema).
The clearest answer is overlapping.

Because they did not meet you – תדה ניב: Tosafot raise the following difficulty: Why doesn’t Rabbi Yehuda likewise expound: An Egyptian man and not an Egyptian woman? Tosafot Yehezkel and the Ramban explain that with respect to Egyptian converts, Rabbi Yehuda relies on the phrase “that are born to them” (Deuteronomy 23:9), which makes the issue dependent on birth, a matter that applies equally to males and females.

Because they did not meet you – תדה ניב: The details of this exposition involve many difficulties. The Rashba raises the point that the verse “Because they did not meet you” refers only to Ammonites, whereas David’s case concerned Moabites. He answers that since the Bible deals with the two nations together, they must be treated the same way. The Ramban, in his Commentary on the Torah, asks the following question: It is stated explicitly: “You shall sell me food for money… as the Moabites, who dwell in Ar; did to me!” (Deuteronomy 23:20). Doesn’t this indicate that the Moabites did ultimately provide them with food and water? One suggestion is that only a few Moabites, i.e., the residents of Ar and certain others, acted in this manner (see Meiri). The clearest answer is offered in the Jerusalem Talmud: With regard to the Moabites the verse states that the reason they are barred from entering into the congregation is “because they hired Balaam” (Deuteronomy 23:2), and it is certainly not the way of women to be involved in such a transaction.

You have loosened my bands – הספרון: The Riaf states that this exposition refers to the beginning of the verse, which states: “I am Your servant, the son of Your maidservant; You have loosened my bands (moserat)” Ruth calls herself “your maidservant Ruth” (Ruth 3:9), and this verse refers to the prohibitions (issurim) relating to her.

The Gemara comments that this disagreement with regard to the source of the halakha that it is permitted for an Ammonite or Moabite woman to enter into the congregation is like the following dispute between tannaim: The verse states: “An Ammonite or a Moabite” (Deuteronomy 23:4). 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. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, who derives the halakha from the masculine form of these two terms. Rabbi Shimon says: The verse states: “Because they did not meet you” with bread and with water on the way.” (Deuteronomy 23:4). Since it is the way of a man, but not the way of a woman, to go forth to meet guests, females were not included in the prohibition.

With regard to the same issue, Rava taught: What is the meaning of that which is written: “You have loosened my bands” (Psalm 116:17)? David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, You have loosened the two bands that were on me, in accordance with my regard for the Malone women, or Ammonite or Moab, is David and his royal house.

Rava further taught: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Many things have You done, O Lord my God, Your wonders and Your thoughts are upon us” (Psalm 40:8)? Upon me is not stated, but rather “upon us,” which teaches that Rehoboam, son of Solomon and grandson of David, was sitting on the lap of David, who said to him: These two verses were stated about me and about you, as Rehoboam’s mother was Na’ama the Ammonite.

With regard to the same issue, Rava also taught: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Then I said: Behold, I have come; in the scroll of a book it is written about me” (Psalm 40:8)? David said: I had said that I have come only now; my life was created only recently, at the time of my birth. But I did not know that it was already written about me in the scroll of a book, that an ancient text already hints at my existence. There, with regard to the daughters of Lot, it is written: “And your two daughters that are found here” (Genesis 19:15), and here, with regard to David, it is written: “I have found David, My servant; I have anointed him with My holy oil” (Psalm 89:21). The last article that was found among the daughters of Lot, the mothers of Ammon and Moab, is David and his royal house.

Ulla said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The daughter of an Ammonite convert is fit not only to marry an ordinary Israelite, but even to marry into the priesthood. Rava bar Ulla said to Ulla: In accordance with whose opinion did you state this halakha? If it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn’t he say that the daughter of a male convert is like the daughter of a male balal, one rendered unfit for the priesthood, which means that the daughter of any convert should be disqualified from the priesthood? And if you spoke in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, it is obvious that this is the case, as he said that even if a male convert marries a female convert, his daughter is fit to marry into the priesthood.
And if you would say that Rabbi Yosei spoke only of those converts who are fit to enter into the congregation, but with regard to this one, an Ammonite convert, who is not fit to enter into the congregation, his daughter is not fit to marry a priest, there is a difficulty: From where does he derive this distinction?

The Gemara answers: He derives this from the case of a High Priest who married a widow, a woman whom he is prohibited from marrying. Just as his daughter is disqualified from marrying into the priesthood, so too is the daughter of an Ammonite convert disqualified from marrying into the priesthood. However, an objection may be raised: What comparison can be made to a High Priest who married a widow, which is a stringent prohibition, as his intercourse involves a transgression? Can one say the same with regard to the daughter of an Ammonite convert, who could be born from a permitted relationship, e.g., from a male Ammonite convert who married a female Ammonite convert?

The Gemara answers: Let the case of a halal prove that this is not relevant, as his intercourse does not involve a transgression and yet his children are also halalim, who are prohibited from marrying into the priesthood. However, another objection may be raised: What comparison can be made to a halal, seeing that his essential formation involved a transgression, and therefore it is understandable that his disqualification extends to his offspring. Can one say the same with regard to the daughter of an Ammonite convert who was not the product of a forbidden union?

The Gemara answers: Let the case of a High Priest who marries a widow prove that this is not relevant, as he was not the product of a forbidden union but nevertheless his daughter is disqualified from marrying into the priesthood. And the derivation has reverted to its starting point, and the discussion can go back and forth.

At this point, however, the halakha can be derived from a combination of the two sources: The aspect of this case, that of a High Priest, is not like the aspect of that case, that of a halal, and the aspect of that case is not like the aspect of this case; their common denominator is that he is not included in the majority of the congregation, i.e., the man is governed by a halakha that differs from that of most Jews. The High Priest’s intercourse with a widow involves a transgression, and the halal is the product of a forbidden union. And in each case, the man’s daughter is disqualified from marrying into the priesthood. So too, an Ammonite convert is not included in the majority of the congregation, as it is prohibited for him to enter into the congregation of Israel, and so his daughter is also disqualified from marrying into the priesthood.

The Gemara objects: What is the common denominator between the case of the High Priest and that of the halal that prevents one from utilizing it as a paradigm for other cases? Both of those cases include an aspect of transgression; the High Priest engaged in a forbidden act of intercourse, and the halal is the product of a forbidden union. Perhaps that is the reason that the daughter in each of these cases is prohibited from marrying into the priesthood. In the case of the Ammonite convert, however, there is no transgression.

The Gemara answers: Perhaps you spoke of an Ammonite convert who married the daughter of a Jew, and Rabbi Yohanan wished to teach that although his intercourse involves a transgression, as it is prohibited for him to enter into the congregation, his daughter is nevertheless fit to marry into the priesthood. Ulla said to him: Yes, this was Rabbi Yohanan’s teaching.

The derivation has reverted to its starting point – a new paradigm. This style of argumentation is often utilized when the Gemara tries to derive a halakha by means of analogy (binyan av). If it cannot be proven from one case, as the comparison between the two halakhot is subject to refutation, the Gemara will cite a second case to which the previous difficulty does not apply. When a different problem is discovered in the second case, the discussion reverts back to the first case, which does not involve the present difficulty. Therefore, as the argument goes back and forth between these two proofs, the Gemara combines them in order to find their common denominator, a shared aspect from which one can derive the halakha that can be applied to other cases.
An established female convert – מִכַּנָּהּ

The daughter of an Ammonite convert in forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth – בַּת שְׁנֵי לְﬠַמּוֹנִי

If an Ammonite convert or a second-generation Egyptian convert married a woman of Jewish birth, the daughter is fit to marry even into the priesthood, in accordance with Rabbi Yoḥanan’s ruling cited by Ravin (Rambam Sefer Kadusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia 19:33).

The daughter of an Ammonite convert in forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth – בַּת שְׁנֵי לְﬠַמּוֹנִי

HaShas 54

As, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to the daughter of an Ammonite convert who is the offspring of his forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth, and similarly, with regard to the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert from his forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth, Rabbi Yoḥanan said that she is fit to marry into the priesthood, whereas Reish Lakish said that she is disqualified from marrying a priest. Reish Lakish said she is disqualified, as he derives from the halakha governing a High Priest who married a widow that the daughter of any forbidden union is disqualified from the priesthood. Rabbi Yoḥanan said she is fit,

As when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to the daughter of an Ammonite convert who is the offspring of his forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth, and similarly, with regard to the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert from his forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth, Rabbi Yoḥanan said that she is fit to marry into the priesthood, whereas Reish Lakish said that she is disqualified from marrying a priest. Reish Lakish said she is disqualified, as he derives from the halakha governing a High Priest who married a widow that the daughter of any forbidden union is disqualified from the priesthood. Rabbi Yoḥanan said she is fit,

An established female convert – מִכַּנָּהּ

The early authorities disagree with regard to the meaning of this term. According to Rashi, it is similar to minnhono, meaning a convert who comes from well-established lineage, from converts whose marriage did not involve a transgression. The Arukh explains that mikana means from her ken, her base. In other words, one whose base, i.e., her mother, was also a convert (see Gilg hence Amud)

And according to this version – מִכַּנָּהּ

The Rashba is puzzled by this passage, as the question and answer with regard to the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert is relevant only according to the first version, not the second. He maintains that the Gemara could have made this point briefly, but preferred to do so at length in the form of a discussion. In sum, the question applies only according to the first version.

The Gemara asks: What are these two peoples? If we say this is referring to an Ammonite man who married an Ammonite woman, and what is the meaning of “from two peoples,” that they are legally considered like two separate peoples, as their males are prohibited from entering into the congregation, whereas their females are permitted to do so, there is a difficulty. In that case, this is the same as an established female convert, as the daughter of such a union is a proper convert in all regards. Rather, it must refer to an Ammonite man who married the daughter of a Jew, as they belong to two separate peoples.

And there are those who say an alternative version of this discussion. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Rabbi Zakkai: I teach that the words “his own people” and the more inclusive phrase “from his own people” come to include a virgin who comes from two peoples, i.e., whose mother was Jewish from birth and whose father was a convert, and that convert is from a people that itself consists of two peoples, i.e., an Ammonite or a Moabite, who hail from peoples whose males are prohibited from entering into the congregation, while it is permitted for their females to do so, and you say only an established female convert and no more?

The Gemara asks: And according to this second version, if from where does Rabbi Yoḥanan derive that the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert who had entered into a forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth is fit to marry into the priesthood, as with respect to Egyptian converts, there is no difference between males and females? And if you would say that he derives this from the case of an Ammonite convert who married the daughter of a Jew, the following difficulty arises: What comparison can be made to an Ammonite convert who married the daughter of a Jew and had a daughter, who is permitted to enter the congregation although she is an Ammonite, as female Ammonite converts are entirely permitted? Perhaps for this reason it is permitted for the daughter to marry into the priesthood as well. Can one say the same with regard to the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert who had entered into a forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth, when it is prohibited for female Egyptian converts, like their male counterparts, to enter into the congregation until the third generation?
The Gemara responds: Let the case of a second-generation male Egyptian convert who married a second-generation female Egyptian convert prove that this is not irrelevant, as it is permitted for their daughter, a third-generation Egyptian convert, to enter the congregation, even though she belongs to the Egyptian people, whose female converts are prohibited in the same manner as their male converts.

The Gemara refutes this proof: What comparison can be made to a second-generation male Egyptian convert who married a second-generation female Egyptian convert, seeing that his intercourse does not involve a transgression, as it is permitted for him to marry her? Can one say the same with regard to a second-generation Egyptian convert who entered into a forbidden marriage with the daughter of a Jew?

This leads back to the first proof: Let an Ammonite man who married the daughter of a Jew prove that this is not irrelevant, as they too entered into a forbidden union, and yet it is permitted for the daughter of that marriage to marry into the priesthood. And the derivation has reverted to its starting point, and the discussion can go back and forth. The two cases differ in their particular aspects, but their common denominator is that it is permitted for the daughter to marry into the priesthood. So too, it is permitted for the daughter of a second-generation Egyptian convert who married a woman who was born Jewish to marry into the priesthood.

Rav Yosef said: This is what I heard Rav Yehuda says in his lecture about the phrases “his own people” and “from his own people,” and at the time I did not know what he was saying. Now I understand that he was saying that it is permitted for the daughter of an Ammonite convert who married a Jewish woman to marry into the priesthood, as taught by Rabbi Yohanan.

When Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Zakai taught before Rabbi Yohanan as follows: An Ammonite woman is fit, her son from an Ammonite is unfit, and her daughter from an Ammonite is fit. In what case is this statement said? It is said with regard to an Ammonite man and an Ammonite woman who converted, but her daughter from an Ammonite who did not convert is unfit.

Rabbi Yohanan said to him: Go out and teach it outside, i.e., this baraita is not in accordance with the accepted halakha, and therefore it should not be made part of the regular learning in the study hall. What you said, that an Ammonite woman is fit, is well known and need not be taught because it is just another way of saying that a male Ammonite is barred from entering the congregation but not a female Ammonite. As for the teaching that her son from an Ammonite is unfit, this too is unnecessary, as he is an Ammonite.

But that which you said: Her daughter from an Ammonite is fit, with regard to what issue did you teach this? If we say that she is fit to enter into the congregation, this too is redundant: Now that it was taught that even her mother is fit to enter the congregation, it is necessary to say that she herself, the daughter, is fit to do so? Rather, you must mean to say that she is fit to marry into the priesthood.

The baraita continues: In what case is this statement said? It is said with regard to an Ammonite man and an Ammonite woman who converted, but her daughter from an Ammonite man is unfit. What is meant here by her daughter from an Ammonite? If we say it means an Ammonite man who married an Ammonite woman, and they converted prior to the birth of their daughter, this is an established female convert, who was previously declared fit to marry into the priesthood. Rather, it must mean an Ammonite convert who unlawfully married the daughter of a Jew, and according to what is stated here, their daughter is unfit to marry a priest. Rabbi Yohanan, however, ruled that such a woman is fit, and therefore he said to Rabbi Zakai: Go out and teach it outside, as this baraita is unreliable.
What refutation – Ma'ase Shesheshu: In the Rambam’s Commentary on the Mishna, a simple answer is provided to Rabbi Shimon’s argument: There is a difference between the prohibitions governing Egyptians and Edomites and those relating to Ammonites and Moabites. In the case of Egyptians and Edomites the Torah does not provide a reason for their prohibition, and therefore there are no grounds for supposing that the halakha of females differs in any way from that of males. This is not the case with regard to Ammonites and Moabites. The later authorities point out that the fact that the Gemara does not suggest this answer poses no difficulty, as the mishna does not specify the response Rabbi Shimon received, and therefore it is possible that the Rabbis had recourse to several arguments, not all of which are cited by the Gemara.

I am stating a halakha – Toresh shel Rav Yehuda: This does not mean that if it is a tradition the Rabbis would accept Rabbi Shimon’s opinion as the actual halakha, as they did not rescind their view even after he affirmed that he had learned it by tradition. Rather, they meant that if it is a tradition, they will allow it to remain unchallenged while they will preserve their own traditional teachings (Rabbi Yehuda al-Madari).

It is taught in the mishna that Egyptian and Edomite converts are prohibited from entering into the congregation only for three generations, both males and females, while Rabbi Shimon permits females immediately based on the following a fortiori inference. If regarding Ammonites and Moabites, where the Torah prohibited the males with an eternal prohibition, it permitted the females immediately, then regarding Egyptians and Edomites, where it prohibited the males for only three generations, the females should certainly be permitted immediately. Rabbi Shimon’s colleagues informed him that there is a refutation of his argument. The Gemara asks: What is this refutation mentioned by the mishna?

Rabba bar bar Han per Rabbi Yohanan said: It is because it may be said that those with whom relations are forbidden, i.e., incestuous relationships, prove that the above-mentioned factor is irrelevant, as the Torah prohibits them only for up to three generations, i.e., up to his granddaughters, and yet it prohibits both males and females, i.e., the daughter of his son and the daughter of his daughter.

The Gemara rejects this proof: What comparison can be made to those with whom relations are forbidden, which involve stringent prohibitions, as they entail the punishment of karet? The Gemara answers: Let the prohibition with regard to a manzer prove that this is not relevant, as its violation does not involve the punishment of karet and yet it applies equally to males and females.

The Gemara rejects this argument: What comparison can be made to a manzer, seeing that he is governed by the stringency that he is forever unfit to enter into the congregation for all generations? The Gemara counters: Let those with whom relations are forbidden prove that this is not relevant, as the Torah prohibits them only for up to three generations. And the derivation has reverted to its starting point, and the discussion can go back and forth.

However, the halakha with regard to an Egyptian can be derived from a combination of the two sources. The aspect of this case, that of incestuous relationships, is not like the aspect of that case, that of a manzer, and the aspect of that case is not like the aspect of this case; their common denominator is that their prohibition applies to both males and females. I will also bring the additional halakha of a male Egyptian convert and a female Egyptian convert that they are forbidden, both males and females.

The Gemara objects: What is unique about the common denominator between the cases of incestuous relationships and a manzer that prevents utilizing it as a paradigm for other cases? Both include an aspect of karet, either with respect to the act of incestuous intercourse itself or with respect to the conception of the manzer, as a manzer is the offspring of a union punishable by karet. However, the prohibition concerning an Egyptian, which does not include an aspect of karet, may apply only to males, but not females.

And the Rabbis, who reject Rabbi Shimon’s proof, derive the prohibition applying to female Egyptians from the halakha governing a halal, one rendered unfit for the priesthood. A halal is the child of a union for which the parties involved are liable to receive punishment for the transgression of a positive mitzva, e.g., the child of a High Priest and a woman who was not a virgin when he married her, and this status applies to males and females alike. And this is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, who ruled that the child of such a relationship is a halal.

The Gemara asks: And what did Rabbi Shimon mean when he responded: Not so? The Gemara explains that this is what he said to them: According to my own opinion, I do not hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, and therefore your refutation is not valid for me. But even according to you, who do maintain in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, I am nevertheless stating a halakha handed down to me by my teachers that female Egyptians and Edomites are permitted.
It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon said to them: I am stating a traditional halakha, and furthermore a verse supports me, as the verse with regard to Edomites and Egyptians states: “The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:9), teaching that the prohibition applies to their sons, but not to their daughters.⁹

The Sages taught a baraita that further clarifies the matter: The prohibition with regard to Egyptians and Edomites applies only to their sons, but not to their daughters; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yehuda said: The verse states: “The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord,” and the phrase “born to them” indicates that the verse made their prohibition dependent on birth, with regard to which there is no difference between males and females.

Rabbi Yohanan says: Had Rabbi Yehuda not said that the verse made their prohibition dependent on birth, so that females are also included in the prohibition, he would not have found his hands and feet in the study hall, i.e., he would have been caught in a self-contradiction. Why? Since the Master said that according to Rabbi Yehuda a congregation of converts is also called a congregation of the Lord,⁸

Sons but not daughters – המזער של אדום אינא שמה הא לן של אדום נסער
A congregation of converts is not called a congregation of the Lord. Therefore, all those for whom it is prohibited to enter into the congregation, e.g., mamzerim, are permitted to female converts, and similarly, converts and emancipated slaves are permitted to mamzeret, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei and against that of Rabbi Yehuda (Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEr 422).

HALAKHA
How could a second-generation Egyptian achieve purity?⁰ Many early authorities proposed various ways by which a second-generation Egyptian convert can achieve purity without entering into the congregation, even according to Rabbi Yehuda (see Tosafot, Ramban, Rashba, and Meiri). Some later authorities suggest that he may marry a mamzeret after ten generations, in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish, or that he may marry without a betrothal, or by means of levirate marriage (see Arukh HaYehudi). In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that according to Rabbi Yehuda he may purify his seed by marrying an emancipated maidervant, who is not part of the congregation of converts, and therefore he is permitted to her, and their children will be fit from both sides.

NOTES
⁸וְרַגְלָיו דְּאִי הָתָם דִּכְתָבֵיהּ אָמַר: It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon said to them: I am stating a traditional halakha, and furthermore a verse supports me, as the verse with regard to Edomites and Egyptians states: “The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:9), teaching that the prohibition applies to their sons, but not to their daughters.

⁹ﬠִיקָּר אִекְרֵי בָּנוֹת דְּאִי יִוָּלְדוּ לָאו תְּלָאָן דְּאִי, רַבִּי גֵּרִים אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב: It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon said to them: I am stating a traditional halakha, and furthermore a verse supports me, as the verse with regard to Edomites and Egyptians states: “The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:9), teaching that the prohibition applies to their sons, but not to their daughters.

¹⁰וְתַנְיָא הוּא הֲרֵי Th⁰ This is a case of if that leads to an allowance, the Torah does not write. The Torah teaches the halakha of a mamzer, whose very existence is the result of his parents having engaged in forbidden relations, in order to render it prohibited for him to enter into the congregation. However, it would not teach the halakha of a second-generation Egyptian convert who transgressed and married a woman who was forbidden to him, in order to permit his offspring to enter into the congregation.

The Gemara asks: But isn’t there the halakha governing one who remarries his divorced wife after she had been married to another man? This is a case of if that leads to an allowance, and yet the Torah writes it. The words “It is an abomination before the Lord” (Deuteronomy 24:4) stated with regard to this case teach that although the woman herself is forbidden to her first husband, if she nevertheless remarried him, their children are fit to enter into the congregation. The Gemara answers: There, the Torah writes that case due to the basic prohibition, i.e., that a man may not remarry his divorced wife after she has been married to another man, and the allowance with regard to their children is learned incidentally. 

The Gemara raises an objection: But isn’t there the halakha governing one who remarries his divorced wife after she had been married to another man? This is a case of if that leads to an allowance, and yet the Torah writes it. The words “It is an abomination before the Lord” (Deuteronomy 24:4) stated with regard to this case teach that although the woman herself is forbidden to her first husband, if she nevertheless remarried him, their children are fit to enter into the congregation. The Gemara answers: There, the Torah writes that case due to the basic prohibition, i.e., that a man may not remarry his divorced wife after she has been married to another man, and the allowance with regard to their children is learned incidentally.

NOTES
⁹אִשֶׁר יְהוּדָה יִוָּלְדוּ: A congregation of converts is not called a congregation of the Lord. Therefore, all those for whom it is prohibited to enter into the congregation, e.g., mamzerim, are permitted to female converts, and similarly, converts and emancipated slaves are permitted to mamzeret, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei and against that of Rabbi Yehuda (Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEr 422).