

”מצרי” ולא מצרית! שאני הכא דמפרש טעמא דקרא: ”על אשר לא קדמו אתכם בלחם ובמים” – דרכו של איש לקדם, ולא דרכה של אשה לקדם. היה להם לקדם אנשים לקראת אנשים ונשים לקראת נשים! אישתתיק.

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 23:5). 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.

מיד: ”ויאמר המלך שאל אתה בן מי זה העלם”. התם קרי ליה ”נער”, הכא קרי ליה ”עלם”, הכי קא אמר ליה: הלכה נתעלמה ממך, צא ושאל בבית המדרש, שאל, אמרו ליה: ”עמוני” ולא עמונית, ”מואבי” ולא מואבית.

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** [*elem*]. 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.**

Perek VIII
Daf 77 Amud a

אקשי ליה דויג כל הני קושיותא, אישתתיקו, בעי לאכרוזי עליה, מיד ויעמשה בן איש ושמו יתרא הישראלי אשר בא אל אביגיל בת נחש, וכתוב יתר הישמעאל” אמר רבא: מלמד שחגר חרבו כישמעאל ואמר: כל מי שאינו שומע הלכה זו – ידקר בחרב, כך מקובלני מבית דינו של שמואל הרמתי: ”עמוני” ולא עמונית, ”מואבי” ולא מואבית.

Doeg raised before them all those objections from the others who are disqualified from entering into the congregation, and **they were silent**, not knowing how to respond. Doeg then **wanted to proclaim** that David was disqualified from entering into the congregation. He was **immediately** answered. Here it says: **“Now Amasa was the son of a man, whose name was Jithra the Israelite, that went into Abigail the daughter of Nahash”** (II Samuel 17:25), and yet elsewhere it is written that Amasa’s father was named **“Jether the Ishmaelite”** (1 Chronicles 2:17). Rava said: This teaches that he girded his sword like Ishmael,^N i.e., like an Arab, and said: **Whoever does not accept this halakha and act accordingly shall be stabbed with the sword. This is the tradition that I received from the court of Samuel from Rama: An Ammonite man is prohibited from entering into the congregation, but not an Ammonite woman; a Moabite man is prohibited from entering into the congregation, but not a Moabite woman.**

ומי מהימן? והאמר רבי אבא אמר רב: כל תלמיד חכם שמונה הלכה ובא, אם קודם מעשה אמרה – שומעין לו, ואם לאו – אין שומעין לו! שאני הכא, דהא שמואל ובית דינו קיים.

The Gemara asks about this incident: **And is he trusted to offer such testimony? But didn’t Rabbi Abba say that Rav said: With regard to every Torah scholar who issues a halakhic ruling^N based on a tradition he claims to have received from his teacher, and that ruling has practical ramifications for himself as well, if he stated the ruling already before the incident, i.e., before it had a bearing on his own case, one listens to him; but if not, if he reported the tradition only after it was personally relevant to him, one does not listen to him,^H as he is an interested party.** Since Amasa was the son of Jesse’s daughter Abigail, as stated in the aforementioned verse in Chronicles, the matter certainly affected his own status. The Gemara answers: **Here it is different, as Samuel and the other members of his court were still living,^N and the truth of Amasa’s report could be easily verified.**

NOTES

He girded his sword like Ishmael – כישמעאל – 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 Riaf). 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 (*Iyyun Ya’akov*). The *Arukh LaNer* explains that the reference is to Ishmael, son of Nathaniah, 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 *Gilyonei HaShas*).

Every Torah scholar who issues a halakhic ruling – כל תלמיד חכם שמונה 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 commentaries 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 Avraham min HaHar attributes this interpretation to Rashi (see Meiri).

שמואל ובית דינו – Samuel and his court were still living – According to Rashi, there is no concern that one might be lying about a matter that can easily be verified. The Ritva 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

חכם המורה הלכה – 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 king's daughter is all glorious within – כל כבודָהּ בת מלך פְּנִימָהּ: The Maharshal, in his *Yam shel Shlomo*, explains that this verse does not refer to Ammonite or Moabite women, as they certainly are not considered modest; rather, it is speaking of Jewish women. The idea is that since Jewish women stay in their homes, their gentile counterparts cannot greet them with bread and water.

An Ammonite man but not an Ammonite woman – עמוני ולא עמונית: *Tosafot* raise the following difficulty: Why doesn't Rabbi Yehuda likewise expound: An Egyptian man and not an Egyptian woman? *Tosafot Yeshanim* 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 – על דבר אשר לא קדמו: 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 2:28–29); 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 23:5), and it is certainly not the way of women to be involved in such a transaction.

You have loosened my bands – פתחת למוסרי: The Rifa 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 [*moserai*]." Ruth calls herself "your maidservant Ruth" (Ruth 3:9), and this verse refers to the prohibitions [*issurim*] relating to her.

מכל מקום קשׁוּא! הָאָהָרָא תַרְגְּמוּ: "כל כבודָהּ בת מלך פְּנִימָהּ", בְּמַעֲרָבָא אַמְרֵי, וְאִיתִימָא רַבִּי יְצַחְקָא: אָמַר קָרָא וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו אִיָּה שָׂרָה אֲשֶׁתְּךָ וְגו'.

כְּתַנְאֵי "עֲמוּנִי" וְלֹא עֲמוּנִית, "מוֹאֲבִי" וְלֹא מוֹאֲבִית, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אָמַר: "עַל דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא קָדְמוּ אֲתָכֶם בְּלַחֵם וּבַמַּיִם" – דְּרַכּוּ שֶׁל אִישׁ לְקַדֵּם וְכו'.

דְּרַשׁ רַבָּא: מַאי דְּכֵתִיב "פְּתַחְתָּ לְמוֹסְרֵי" אָמַר דּוֹד לְפָנֵי הַקְּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא: רַבּוֹנוּ שֶׁל עוֹלָם, שְׁנֵי מוֹסְרוֹת שְׁהָיוּ עָלַי פְּתַחְתָּם, רוּת הַמּוֹאֲבִיָּה וְנַעֲמָה הָעֲמוּנִית.

דְּרַשׁ רַבָּא: מַאי דְּכֵתִיב "רַבּוֹת עֲשִׂיתָ אֵתָּהּ ה' אֱלֹהֵי נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ וּמַחֲשָׁבוֹתֶיךָ אֵלֵינוּ", "אֱלֹהֵי לֹא נֶאֱמַר אֱלֹהֵי אֵלֵינוּ", מִלְּמַד שְׁהָיָה רַחֲבָעַם יוֹשֵׁב בְּחִיקוֹ שֶׁל דּוֹד, אָמַר לוֹ: עָלַי וְעָלֶיךָ נֶאֱמְרוּ שְׁתֵּי מִקְרָאוֹת הַלָּלוּ.

דְּרַשׁ רַבָּא: מַאי דְּכֵתִיב "אָז אָמַרְתִּי הִנֵּה בָאתִי בְּמַגִּילַת סֵפֶר כְּתוּב עָלַי", אָמַר דּוֹד: אֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי עֵתָּה בָאתִי, וְלֹא יָדַעְתִּי שְׁבַמַּגִּילַת סֵפֶר כְּתוּב עָלַי. הֵתֵם כְּתִיב "הִנְמַצְאוֹת" הָאָהָרָא כְּתִיב "מַצְאוֹתֵי דּוֹד עֲבָדֵי בְּשֶׁמֶן קֶדְשֵׁי מִשְׁחַתֵּנוּ".

אָמַר עוּלָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בֵּת גַּר עֲמוּנִי בְּשָׂרָה לְכַהוֹנָה. אָמַר לִיָּה רַבָּא בַר עוּלָא לְעוּלָא: כִּמְאֵן? אִי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה – הָאָהָרָא: בֵּת גַּר זְכָר כְּבַת חָלָל זְכָר. וְאִי בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי – פְּשִׁיטָא, הָאָהָרָא: אִךְ גַּר שְׁנַשָּׂא גִיּוֹרַת בֵּתוֹ בְּשָׂרָה לְכַהוֹנָה!

The Gemara asks: In any case, the unanswered question raised by Doeg is difficult. The Gemara answers: Here, in Babylonia, they explained the matter based on the verse: "The king's daughter is all glorious within" (Psalms 45:14),ⁿ which indicates that it is unbecoming for a woman to venture outside at all, and therefore the Ammonite women would not have been expected to go forth to meet the Jewish women. In the West, Eretz Yisrael, they say, and some say it was Rabbi Yitzhak who said: The verse states: "And they said to him: Where is Sarah your wife? And he said: Behold, in the tent" (Genesis 18:9), which teaches that it is praiseworthy for a woman to remain inside her home.

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 *tanna'im*: 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,ⁿ 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 23:5). 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" (Psalms 116:16)?ⁿ David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, You have loosened the two bands that were on me, on account of which I and my entire family might have been disqualified, i.e., Ruth the Moabite woman and Na'ama the Ammonite woman. Owing to the allowance granted to Moabite and Ammonite women, we are permitted to enter the congregation.

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" (Psalms 40:6)? 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" (Psalms 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" (Psalms 89:21). The lost 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 *halal*, 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.

וכי תימא: בהגך דראוי לבא בקהל, אבל האי דאין ראוי לבא בקהל – לא מנא ליה?

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?

דיליף מכהן גדול באלמנה. מה לכהן גדול באלמנה שכן ביאתו בעבירה.

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?

קלל יוכית, מה לחלל – שכן יצירתו בעבירה.

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?

כהן גדול יוכית, ותור הדין.

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,^N and the discussion can go back and forth.

לא ראוי זה כראוי זה, ולא ראוי זה כראוי זה, הצד השווה שבהן: שאינו ברוב קהל, ובתו פסולה – אף כאן, שאינו ברוב קהל ובתו פסולה.

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 the congregation of Israel, and so his daughter is also disqualified from marrying into the priesthood.

מה להצד השווה שבהן שכן יש בהן צד עבירה –

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.

דלמא ודאי בעמוני שנשא בת ישראל קאמרת, אף על גב דביאתו בעבירה – בתו בשרה? אמר ליה: אין.

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.

NOTES

^Nתור הדין – 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.

The daughter of an Ammonite convert in forbidden marriage with a woman of Jewish birth – בת גר עמוני: 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 Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 19:13).

דְּכִי אֶתָּא רַבִּין אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בֵּת גַּר עֲמוּנִי וּבֵת מִצְרֵי שֵׁנִי, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: בְּשָׂרָהּ, וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: פְּסוּלָהּ. רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר פְּסוּלָהּ, דִּילִיף לָהּ מִכְּהֵן גְּדוּל בְּאַלְמָנָה. רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר בְּשָׂרָהּ.

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,^H 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,

Perek VIII
Daf 77 Amud b

NOTES

גיורת – An established [*mikanna*] female convert – מִכְּנָה: The early authorities disagree with regard to the meaning of this term. According to Rashi, it is similar to *mimekhona*, 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 *Gilyonei HaShas*).

And according to this version – וְלֵהֲךָ לִישָׁנָא: 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.

דְּתַנִּי רַבִּי זַכַּי קָמִיה דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: "בֵּי אִם בְּתוּלָה מִעַמּוּי וְקַח אִשָּׁה" – לְהַבִּיא גִיּוֹרֵת מִכְּנָה שְׂהִיא בְּשָׂרָהּ לְכַהוֹנָה. וְאָמַר לֵיה: אֲנִי שׁוֹנָה "עַמּוּי" "מִעַמּוּי" – לְהַבִּיא בְּתוּלָה הַבָּאָה מִשְׁנֵי עַמּוּי, וְאֵת אִמְרָת גִּיּוֹרֵת מִכְּנָה וְתוּ לָא?

as Rabbi Zakkai taught the following *baraita* before Rabbi Yoḥanan: That which is stated with regard to a High Priest: "But a virgin of his own people shall he take to wife" (Leviticus 21:14), comes to include an established female convert,^N one who was a convert from birth, i.e., who was born to a father and mother who converted after their marriage but prior to her birth, and this indicates that she is fit to marry into the priesthood. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: I teach that the words "his own people" and the more inclusive phrase "of his own people" come to include a virgin who comes from two peoples, from a union of converts hailing from two different peoples, and you say only an established female convert and no more?

מֵאֵי שְׁנֵי עַמּוּמִין? אִילִּימָא עֲמוּנִי שְׁנָשָׁא עֲמוּנִית, וּמֵאֵי מִשְׁנֵי עַמּוּי, דְּזִכְרִים אֲסוּרִין וְנִקְבּוֹת מוּתָרוֹת – הֵיִינוּ גִיּוֹרֵת מִכְּנָה! אֶלָּא בְּעַמּוּנִי שְׁנָשָׁא בֵּת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

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.

וְאִיכָּא דְּאָמְרִי, אָמַר לֵיה: אֲנִי שׁוֹנָה "עַמּוּי" "מִעַמּוּי" – לְהַבִּיא בְּתוּלָה הַבָּאָה מִשְׁנֵי עַמּוּי, וּמֵעַם שֵׁשׁ בּו שְׁנֵי עַמּוּי, וְאֵת אִמְרָת גִּיּוֹרֵת מִכְּנָה וְתוּ לָא?

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?

וְלֵהֲךָ לִישָׁנָא, בֵּת מִצְרֵי שֵׁנִי דְּבְשָׂרָהּ לְכַהוֹנָה מִנָּא לֵיה? וְכִי תִּימָא דִּילִיף מִעַמּוּנִי שְׁנָשָׁא בֵּת יִשְׂרָאֵל – מַה לְעַמּוּנִי שְׁנָשָׁא בֵּת יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁכֵן נִקְבּוֹת מוּתָרוֹת!

The Gemara asks: And according to this second version,^N 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?

Go out and teach it outside – פוק תני לברא – This expression indicates that a *baraita* quoted in the study hall is viewed by the Sage as insufficiently established, either because it contains an internal contradiction or due to its unclear wording. Such a *baraita* is unsuitable for discussion in the study hall. Even if the scholar teaching the *baraita* knows that it represents a tradition, the text must be clarified properly before it is presented for debate.

מצרי שני שנשא מצרית שניה יוכיח.

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 relevant, 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.**

מה למצרי שני שנשא מצרית שניה – שכן אין ביאתו בעבירה!

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?**

עמוני שנשא בת ישראל יוכיח, וחזר הדין וכו'.

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.

אמר רב יוסף: היינו דשמענא ליה לרב יהודה דאמר "עמיו" "מעמיו" ולא ידענא מאי קאמר.

Rav Yosef said: **This is what I heard Rav Yehuda say 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 Yoḥanan.

כי אתא רב שמואל בר יהודה אמר, הכי תנא קמיה: אשה עמונית בשרה, בנה מעמוני פסול, ובתה מעמוני בשרה, במה דברים אמורים – בעמוני ועמונית שנתגיירו, אבל בתה מעמוני – פסולה.

When Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Zakkai taught before Rabbi Yoḥanan 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.**

אמר ליה: פוק תני לברא. מאי דאמרת אשה עמונית בשרה – עמוני ולא עמונית, בנה מעמוני פסול, דהא עמוני הוא.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: **Go out and teach it outside,^N 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.**

ובתה מעמוני בשרה, למאי? אילימא לבא בקהל – השתא אמה בשרה, היא מיבעיא? אלא לכהונה.

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, is it 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.**

במה דברים אמורים – בעמוני ועמונית שנתגיירו, אבל בתה מעמוני – פסולה. מאי בתה מעמוני? אילימא עמוני שנשא עמונית – היינו גיורת מכנה. אלא, עמוני שנשא בת ישראל. אמר ליה: פוק תני לברא.

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 Yoḥanan, however, ruled that such a woman is fit, and therefore he said to Rabbi Zakkai: Go out and teach it outside, as this *baraita* is unreliable.**

What refutation – מאי תשובה – 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 – הלכה אני אומר – 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).

”מצרי ואדומי אינן אסורין” וכו'. מאי תשובה?

אמר רבה בר רב הונא אמר רבי יוחנן: משום דאיכא למימר: ערויות יוכיחו, שלא אסר בהן אלא עד שלשה דורות, אחד זכרים ואחד נקבות.

מה לערויות שכן כרת. ממזר יוכיח.

מה לממזר שכן אינו ראוי לבא בקהל לעולם, ערויות יוכיחו. ותזר הדין.

לא ראוי זה כראוי זה ולא ראוי זה כראוי זה, הצד השונה שבהן: שאסורין, ואחד זכרים ואחד נקבות, אף אני אביא מצרי ומצרית שיהיו אסורין, אחד זכרים ואחד נקבות.

מה להצד השונה שבהן שכן יש בהן צד כרת.

ורבנן: מחלל, דתייבי עשה וכרבי אליעזר בן יעקב.

ומאי "לא כבי"? הכי קאמר להו: לדידי – לא סבירא לי דרבי אליעזר בן יעקב, לדידכו דסבירא לכו כרבי אליעזר בן יעקב – הלכה אני אומר.

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^N** mentioned by the mishna?

Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan 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 granddaughter, 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 mamzer 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 mamzer**, 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 *mamzer*, 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 *mamzer* 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 *mamzer*, as a *mamzer* 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 Ya'akov**, 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 Ya'akov**, 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 Ya'akov, I am nevertheless stating a halakha^N** handed down to me by my teachers that female Egyptians and Edomites are permitted.

תניא, אמר להן רבי שמעון: הלכה
אני אומר. ועוד: מקרא מסייגני:
"בנים ולא בנות."

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.^N

תנו רבנן: "בנים" ולא בנות, דברי רבי
שמעון. אמר רבי יהודה: הרי הוא
אומר "בנים" אשר יולדו להם דור
שלישי – הכתוב תלאן בלידה.

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.

אמר רבי יוחנן: אי לא דאמר רבי
יהודה הכתוב תלאן בלידה – לא
מצא ידיו ורגליו בבית המדרש. בין
דאמר מר "קהל גרים איקרי קהל" –

Rabbi Yoḥanan 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,^H

NOTES

Sons but not daughters – **בנים ולא בנות**: The Ritva points out that based on this verse one could just as easily claim that sons should be permitted after three generations, while daughters are disqualified forever. He explains that since the verse speaks of the prohibition proscribing Egyptian and Edomite males, and it limits the prohibition to three generations, the implication is that whoever is not in this category is permitted outright. The *Arukh LaNer* answers that there is no reason to render females forbidden for any longer than males, as any justification for a permanent ban would apply more to sons than to daughters.

HALAKHA

A congregation of converts – **קהל גרים**: 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 *mamzerot*, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei and against that of Rabbi Yehuda (*Shulḥan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:22).

Perek VIII

Daf 78 Amud a

מצרי שני במאי יטהר? דלמא דאי
עבר ונסיב. דאי לא כתוב קרא.

how could a second-generation Egyptian convert ever achieve purity,^N so that it is permitted for his offspring, the third generation, to enter into the congregation? He may marry neither a Jew nor a female Egyptian convert. The Gemara answers: Perhaps it means that if he transgressed and married a convert or a Jewish woman, his seed will be purified. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: A case of: That if, is not written in the verse. In other words, the Bible does not speak of situations that can arise only through the commission of a transgression.

הרי ממזר, דאי, וכתביה קרא! דאי
לאיסורא – כתב, דאי להיתרא –
לא כתב.

The Gemara asks: But isn't there the *halakha* of a *mamzer*, which is a case of that if, as a *mamzer* is the child of a forbidden union, and yet the verse writes it? The Gemara answers: A case of that if that results in a prohibition, the Torah writes, but a case of that 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.

הרי מחזיר גרושתו, דאי להיתרא,
וכתביה! התם משום עיקר איסורא
הוא דכתביה.

The Gemara raises an objection: But isn't there the *halakha* governing one who remarries his divorcée after she had been married to another man? This is a case of that 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

How could a second-generation Egyptian achieve purity – **מצרי שני במאי יטהר**: 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 LaNer*). In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that according to Rabbi Yehuda he may purify his seed by marrying an emancipated maidservant, 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.