

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.

NOTES

Why is it stated: “Sons” – לָמָּה נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים – Even Rabbi Shimon, who expounds this word to exclude daughters, would agree that this is not the primary source of that *halakha*, as he merely cites the verse in support of a *halakha* that he derives by way of an *a fortiori* inference (Otzar HaShitot).

HALAKHA

From them you should count – מִהֵמָּה מְנָה – Egyptian and Edomite converts, both males and females, are disqualified from entering into the congregation until the third generation. Consequently, it is prohibited for the son of an Egyptian convert to enter into the congregation, but it is permitted for his grandson to do so (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:3).

Follow their disqualification – הִלֵּךְ אַחֵר פְּסוּלָן – If a convert who is disqualified from entering into the congregation unlawfully married a Jew, the status of the child born to them follows the unfit parent (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:6).

A pregnant Egyptian woman who converted – מִצְרִית מְבִיטָה שְׁנֵי יוֹלְדוֹת – If a pregnant Egyptian woman converted, the child born to her is considered a second-generation Egyptian convert (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:20; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:4).

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: אִם נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים – לָמָּה נֶאֱמַר דּוֹרוֹת, וְאִם נֶאֱמַר דּוֹרוֹת לָמָּה נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים? אִם נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים וְלֹא נֶאֱמַר דּוֹרוֹת הֵייתִי אוֹמֵר: בֶּן רֵאשׁוֹן וְשֵׁנִי – אֶסוּר, שְׁלִישִׁי – מוּתָר, לְכֹךְ נֶאֱמַר דּוֹרוֹת.

וְאִם נֶאֱמַר דּוֹרוֹת וְלֹא נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים הֵייתִי אוֹמֵר: לְאוֹתָן הָעוֹמְדִים עַל הַר סִינַי, לְכֹךְ נֶאֱמַר בָּנִים.

“לָהֶם” – מִהֵמָּה מְנָה, “לָהֶם” – הִלֵּךְ אַחֵר פְּסוּלָן.

וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתָּב “לָהֶם” וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתָּב “אֲשֶׁר יוֹלְדוֹ”. דָּאֵי כְּתָב רַחֲמָנָא “אֲשֶׁר יוֹלְדוֹ” הוּא אֲמִינָא: מִבְּנֵיהֶם מְנָה, כְּתָב רַחֲמָנָא “לָהֶם”. וְאֵי כְּתָב רַחֲמָנָא “לָהֶם” – הוּא אֲמִינָא: מִצְרִית מְבִיטָה שְׁנֵי יוֹלְדוֹת הִיא וּבִנָּה – חַד, כְּתָב רַחֲמָנָא “אֲשֶׁר יוֹלְדוֹ”.

וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתָּב “לָהֶם” הֶכָּא, וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתָּב “לוֹ” גְּבִי מְמוֹר.

דָּאֵי כְּתָב רַחֲמָנָא הֶכָּא – מִשּׁוּם דְּבָא מְטִיפָה פְּסוּלָה, אֲבָל מְמוֹר דְּבָא מְטִיפָה בְּשִׂרָה – אֵימָא לָא.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: The verse states with respect to Egyptian and Edomite converts that “the sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:9). If it is stated “sons” why is it also stated “generation,” and if it is stated “generation” why is it also stated “sons”?²⁸ One of these terms seems superfluous. The *baraita* explains: If it had stated only “sons” and not stated “generation,” I would say that the prohibition depends on the number of the son, meaning that the first and second sons of an Egyptian convert are forbidden, whereas the third is permitted. Therefore, it is stated “generation” to indicate that the prohibition depends not on the number of the son but on his generation.

And conversely, if it had stated only “generation” and not stated “sons,” I would say that the generations are counted from those standing on Mount Sinai, so that any Egyptian born after three generations have passed from the time of the giving of the Torah would be permitted. Therefore, it is stated “sons” to indicate that certain sons are prohibited in later generations as well.

The verse states: “The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord.” The Sages expounded each of the two instances of the words “to them”: The first mention of “to them” teaches that from them you should count.²⁹ The count of generations begins with the converts themselves, as they are considered the first generation, and therefore their grandchildren are permitted. The second mention of “to them” teaches that you should follow their disqualification.³⁰ If a male Egyptian convert married a Jewish woman, or if a female Egyptian convert married a Jewish man, the *halakha* with regard to the offspring born to them is that although one of the parents is not disqualified from entering into marriage, the status of the child follows the unfit parent, who disqualifies his or her offspring until the third generation.

The Gemara comments: And it is necessary to write “to them,” and it is also necessary to write “that are born.” As, if the Merciful One had written only “that are born,” I would say that one should count the generations from the converts’ sons. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “to them” to teach that the converts themselves are counted as the first generation. And if the Merciful One had written only “to them,” I would say that in the case of a pregnant Egyptian woman who converted,³¹ she and her child, i.e., the fetus, are considered one generation, as the fetus is deemed to be a part of its mother. Therefore, the Merciful One writes “that are born,” to indicate that each birth marks a new generation, and accordingly the fetus is regarded as a second-generation Egyptian convert.

The verse concerning a *mamzer* states: “A *mamzer* shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none of his [*lo*] enter into the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:3). And it is necessary to write “to them” here, with regard to an Egyptian convert, to teach that the child’s status follows the disqualified parent in his case, and it is also necessary to write “to him [*lo*]” with regard to a *mamzer*, to teach that a similar *halakha* applies to a *mamzer*. In the translation of the verse, *lo* is translated as: Of his, i.e., of his ilk. However, *lo* can also be translated as: To him.

Lo is written with regard to both the Egyptian and the *mamzer*, as, if the Merciful One had written it only here, with regard to an Egyptian, one might have said that only in this case does the child’s status follow the disqualified parent, because the Egyptian comes from an unfit drop of semen, that of a gentile. But as for a *mamzer*, who comes from a fit drop of semen, as his parents were proper Jews despite their grave sin, one might say that there is no room for such stringency. Therefore, the Torah teaches that the same *halakha* applies to a *mamzer*.

ואי כתב רחמנא גבי ממזר – משום דאין ראוי לבא בקהל לעולם, אביל הכא – אימא לא, צריכא.

אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: מצרי שני שנשא מצרית ראשונה – בנה שלישי הוא. אלמא קסבר: בתר דידיה שדינן ליה.

מתב רב יוסף: רבי טרפון אומר: יכולין ממזרים ליטהר, ביצד? ממזר נשא שפחה – הולד עבד, שחררו – נמצא בן חורין. אלמא בתר דידיה שדינן ליה! שאני התם, דאמר קרא "האשה וילדיה תהיה לאדוניה".

מתב רבא, אמר רבי יהודה: מנמינ גר מצרי היה לי חבר מתלמידי רבי עקיבא, ואמר: אני מצרי ראשון, ונשאתי מצרית ראשונה, אשיא לבני מצרית שניה כדי שיהא בן בני ראוי לבא בקהל. ואי סלקא דעתך בתריה דידיה שדינן ליה – אפילו ראשונה נמי! הא אמר ליה רבי יוחנן לתנא: תמי ראשונה.

כי אתא רב דימי אמר רבי יוחנן: מצרי שני שנשא מצרית ראשונה – בנה שני הוא. אלמא: בתר אימיה שדינן ליה.

אמר ליה אביי: אלא הא דאמר רבי יוחנן: הפריש חטאת מעוברת וילדה, רצה – מתכפר בה. רצה – מתכפר בולדה.

And conversely, if the Merciful One had written this stringent *halakha* only with regard to a *mamzer*, one might have said that this is because he is forever unfit to enter into the congregation, but here, with regard to an Egyptian convert, I might say that this is not the case. Therefore, both verses are necessary.

Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: If a second-generation male Egyptian convert married a first-generation female Egyptian convert, her child is considered a third-generation convert^N for whom it is permitted to enter the congregation. The Gemara comments: Apparently Rabbi Yohanan maintains that we assign the child to him, the father, and not to the mother.

Rav Yosef raised an objection from the following mishna (*Kiddushin* 69a): Rabbi Tarfon says: *Mamzerim can purify themselves*^H over the course of the generations. How so? If a *mamzer* married his non-Jewish maidservant, the child born to them is a slave. If the slave's master, the *mamzer* who owns the maidservant, subsequently freed the child, he becomes a free man and is fit to enter into the congregation. Apparently we assign the child to her, the mother, and not to the father, as the child is deemed a slave rather than a *mamzer*. The Gemara answers: It is different there, in the case of the slave, as the verse states: "The wife and her children shall be her master's" (Exodus 21:4). The words "her children" indicate that the children born to a non-Jewish maidservant are assigned to her.

Rava raised an objection from a previously mentioned *baraita*: Rabbi Yehuda said: Minyamin, an Egyptian convert, was a friend of mine from among the students of Rabbi Akiva, and he said: Following my conversion I was a first-generation Egyptian convert, and so I married another first-generation Egyptian convert.^N 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. Now, if it enters your mind to say that we assign the child to the father, even if he marries off his son to a first-generation Egyptian convert his grandson should be permitted. The Gemara answers: Didn't Rabbi Yohanan already say to the *tanna* reciting the *baraita*: You should teach that Minyamin sought to marry off his son to a first-generation Egyptian convert.^N

When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yohanan said just the opposite: If a second-generation male Egyptian convert married a first-generation female Egyptian convert,^H her son is considered a second-generation convert who is prohibited from entering the congregation. Apparently, Rabbi Yohanan maintains that we assign the child to the mother and not to the father.

Abaye said to him: But what, then, will you say about that which Rabbi Yohanan said: If one set aside a pregnant animal as a sin-offering,^H and the animal later gave birth to a female, if he wishes he may gain atonement with the mother itself, in which case the young is left to graze until it develops a blemish that renders it unfit for sacrifice, whereupon it is sold and the proceeds are used for a gift offering; and if he wishes he may gain atonement with the animal's young, and the mother is left to graze until it develops a blemish.

יכולין ממזרים – *Mamzerim can purify themselves* – ליטהר: If a *mamzer* had intercourse with a gentile woman, the child born to them is a gentile. If the child subsequently converts, he is a full-fledged Jew. Similarly, if a *mamzer* had intercourse with a maidservant, their child is a slave, and if he is subsequently set free, he is a Jew. Therefore, a *mamzer* may marry a maidservant *ab initio*, in order to allow their children to enter the congregation once the children have been released. The *halakha* follows the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon, as the Gemara in *Kiddushin* rules in accordance with his opinion, against the other Sages who disagree with him (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 15:4; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:20).

A second-generation male Egyptian convert married a first-generation female Egyptian convert – מצרי שני שנשא מצרית ראשונה: If a second-generation male Egyptian convert married a first-generation female Egyptian convert, their child is a second-generation Egyptian convert, in accordance with the latter version of Rabbi Yohanan's statement. The early authorities disagree about the rationale of this ruling and about the connection between this *halakha* and the subsequent ones. Therefore, they disagree about whether the mother's status always determines that of the child, so that the child of a first-generation male Egyptian convert and a second-generation female Egyptian convert is a third-generation convert (Ramban; *Tur*), or whether even this child is regarded as a second-generation convert, as only one whose parents are both second-generation converts is considered a third-generation Egyptian, as the Rambam rules (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:20; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:6).

One who set aside a pregnant animal as a sin-offering – המפריש חטאת מעוברת: If one set aside a pregnant animal as a sin-offering and it gave birth to a female, it is as though he had separated two sin-offerings as a guarantee (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:6).

NOTES

בנה שלישי הוא – Her child is a third-generation convert – The early authorities explain that this does not contradict the teaching that the child's status is determined by the parent with the greater disqualification, as that principle applies only to a marriage that involves a transgression. If the marriage itself is permitted, the child's status follows that of the father. The Gemara therefore raises a difficulty from the statement of Rabbi Tarfon, whose example of the marriage of a *mamzer* and a maidservant constitutes a transgression, and even so the child's status is not affected by the parent's disqualification (Rashba).

And I married another first-generation Egyptian convert – ונשאתי מצרית ראשונה: See HALAKHA for the dispute among the halakhic authorities concerning the *halakha* in practice, whether the child's status is determined based on the mother, the father, or the more impaired partner. The Ramban maintains that the mother's status determines that of the child in all cases, but this gives rise to a difficulty: Why did Minyamin marry a first-generation Egyptian? Had he married a second-generation convert, it would have already been permitted for his own son to enter into the congregation. One answer is that Minyamin

was essentially saying that he made a mistake when he married a first-generation Egyptian, but that he would take care not to repeat that error with his son.

Teach a first-generation convert – תמי ראשונה: This is precisely the Jerusalem Talmud's version of the text. The Gemara there also quotes the continuation of the *baraita* that records the dissenting view of Rabbi Akiva that the third-generation Egyptian who is permitted is one who comes from three generations of Jews on both sides of his family.

One who sets aside two sin-offerings as a guarantee – **המפריש שתי חטאות לאחריה**: If one set aside two sin-offerings for the same sin, as a guarantee in case one of the animals becomes unavailable for sacrifice, he may sacrifice either animal as he chooses. The other must be left to graze until it develops a blemish, after which it may be redeemed and the money used for gift offerings (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:5).

The young of a sin-offering – **ולד חטאת**: If an animal that had been set aside for a sin-offering subsequently conceived and gave birth, the offspring goes to its death (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhoh Pesulei HaMukdashin* 4:1).

A pregnant gentile woman who converted – **גויה מעוברת שנתגיירה**: If a pregnant gentile woman converted, her child does not require immersion. If the court that converted her did not know that she was pregnant, there is uncertainty as to whether her immersion counts for the fetus as well (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 13:7; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 268:6).

Interposition with regard to immersion – **חציצה בטבילה**: Nothing may interpose between the object or individual requiring immersion and the water. If an interposition is present, the immersion is invalid. By Torah law, a substance is considered an interposition only if it covers the majority of one's body and is a substance that he is ordinarily particular to remove. However, by rabbinic law, even if one is not particular about the substance but it covers the majority of his body, or if it does not cover the majority of his body but he is particular about removing it, it is considered an interposition that disqualifies the immersion.

As for the immersion of a *nidda*, in practice women are stringent to remove all interpositions of any kind (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhoh Mikvaot* 1:12; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 198:1).

NOTES

A fetus is the thigh of its mother – **עובר ירך אמו הוא**: The later authorities raise a basic question: What is the connection between these two issues? There seems to be no reason that one's lineage should be affected by the ruling on whether or not a fetus is considered part of its mother. One answer is that this is a special case, as the question is not one of disqualification, with regard to which the status of both the father and the mother determines that of the child, but rather of the number of generations. If a fetus is part of its mother, the generations are counted only through her, but if it is considered a separate creature from the time of its conception, the generations can include the father's side as well (*Keren Ora*).

Man of great skull – **מקראפנא**: The *Arukh* cites two interpretations of this term, either a man with a large skull (see Rabbeinu Hananel), or a great and important man, as explained by Rashi on *Eruvin* 22b. With regard to the issue itself, *Tosafot* explain that Rabba, Abaye's teacher or head, figuratively speaking, studied Torah with Rabbi Yohanan in Eretz Yisrael. However, there is no clear proof for this in the Talmud, and chroniclers of the generations maintain that Rabba was never in Eretz Yisrael. If so, Rav Dimi was merely using a picturesque manner of speech (see Maharit).

אי אמרת בשלמא עובר לאו ירך אמו הוא – הוה ליה במפריש שתי חטאות לאחריה, ואמר רב אשעינא: הפריש שתי חטאות לאחריה – מתכפר באחת מהן, והשנייה תרעה.

אלא אי אמרת עובר ירך אמו הוא – הוה ליה ולד חטאת, וולד חטאת למיתה אויל!

אי שתיק. אמר ליה: דלמא שאני התם, דכתיב: "אשר יולדו" – הכתוב תלאו בלידה? אמר ליה: קרקפנא, חיותיה לרישך ביני עמודי בני אמר רבי יוחנן להא שמעתא.

טעמא דכתיב "אשר יולדו", הא בעלמא – בתר אבונה שדינין ליה, אלא הא דאמר רבא: גויה מעוברת שנתגיירה – בנה אין צריך טבילה. אמאי אין צריך טבילה?

וכי תימא משום דרבי יצחק, דאמר רבי יצחק: דבר תורה, רובו ומקפיד עליו חוצץ, רובו שאינו מקפיד עליו אינו חוצץ.

Granted, if you say that a fetus is not considered the thigh, i.e., a part, of its mother but rather a separate creature, despite the fact that it is still attached to her, then an individual in this situation is like one who sets aside two sin-offerings as a guarantee,^h i.e., one who, owing to his concern that his sin-offering might become lost, sets aside two animals from the outset with the intention of using whichever one he chooses. And Rav Oshaya said with regard to such a case: If one set aside two sin-offerings as a guarantee, so that if one is lost he may gain atonement with the other, he gains atonement with one of them, and the second is left to graze until it develops a blemish and can be redeemed.

But if you say that a fetus is considered the thigh of its motherⁿ and is regarded as part of her, it is the young of a sin-offering, and the young of a sin-offering goes to its death.^h Such an animal is not left to graze. Rather, it is put into isolation and caused to die, as it has been sanctified as a sin-offering through its mother but cannot be sacrificed on the altar and used to gain atonement. In summary, it would appear that Rabbi Yohanan himself maintains that a fetus is not considered a part of its mother. Why, then, in the case of the Egyptian convert is the child assigned to the mother and not to the father?

Rav Dimi was silent, momentarily unable to find an answer. Abaye said to him: Perhaps it is different there, with regard to Egyptian converts, as it is written with regard to them: "The sons of the third generation that are born to them may enter to them, the congregation of the Lord" (Deuteronomy 23:9), indicating that the verse made their prohibition dependent on birth, and therefore the child of Egyptian converts is assigned to the mother. Rav Dimi said to him: Man of great skull,ⁿ i.e., man of distinction, I saw your head between the pillars^b of the study hall when Rabbi Yohanan taught this halakha. In other words, you grasped the meaning as though you were actually present in the study hall and heard the statement from Rabbi Yohanan himself.

The Gemara draws an inference: The reason that the child is assigned to its Egyptian mother is that it is written: "That are born to them." But generally, with regard to others for whom it is prohibited to enter into the congregation, we assign the child to the father. The Gemara asks: But what about that which Rava said: If a pregnant gentile woman converted, then her son, who was a fetus at the time of the conversion, does not require immersion^h after he is born. But if the child is not assigned to its mother, why should he not require immersion?

And if you would say that this is because of a statement of Rabbi Yitzhak, there is still a difficulty. As Rabbi Yitzhak said: By Torah law, if some substance is found on a person's body during immersion, and it covers the majority of his body, and he is particular and wants the substance removed, only then is it considered an interposition that invalidates immersion in a ritual bath. If, however, the substance covers the majority of his body, but he is not particular about that substance, it is not considered an interposition.^h Accordingly, it may be argued that although the fetus is covered by its mother, since it is not particular about this necessary covering, the fetus itself is regarded as having undergone valid immersion.

BACKGROUND

Between the pillars – **ביני עמודי**: Both from written sources and from the archaeological excavations conducted at the site, it seems that the synagogue and the study hall in Tiberias, where Rabbi Yohanan lived, were built in the form of a basilica, a building whose roof rests on a row of pillars. Consequently, Rav Dimi's expression: Between the pillars, is essentially describing the structure of this study hall.



Floor of ancient synagogue in Tiberias with remains of pillars

וְהָאֵמֶר רַב כְּהָנָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא רֹבּוֹ, אֲבָל כּוֹל – חוֹצֵץ! שְׂאֵנִי עוֹבֵר דְּהֵיִנוּ רַבִּיתֶיהָ.

כִּי אֵתָא רַבִּינָא אֶמֶר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בְּאוֹמוֹת – הַלֵּךְ אַחֵר הַזְכָּר, נִתְגַּיֵּרוּ – הַלֵּךְ אַחֵר פְּגוּם שְׁבִשְׁנֵיהֶם. “בְּאוֹמוֹת הַלֵּךְ אַחֵר הַזְכָּר” – כִּדְתַנָּיָא: מִנֵּן לְאֶחָד מִן הָאוֹמוֹת שְׂבָא עַל הַכְּנַעֲנִית וְהוֹלִיד בֶּן, שְׂאֵתָהּ רְשָׁאִי לְקִנּוּתוֹ בְּעֶבֶד – שְׁנֵאמֵר “וְגַם מִבְּנֵי הַתּוֹשְׁבִים הַגֵּרִים עִמָּכֶם מִהֶם תִּקְנֶנּוּ”.

כּוֹל אֶפְלוּי אֶחָד מִן הַכְּנַעֲנִים שְׂבָא עַל אַחַת מִן הָאוֹמוֹת וְהוֹלִיד בֶּן שְׂאֵתָהּ רְשָׁאִי לְקִנּוּתוֹ בְּעֶבֶד – תִּלְמוּד לֹאמֵר “אֲשֶׁר הוֹלִידוּ בְּאַרְצְכֶם” – מִן הַנּוֹלָדִים בְּאַרְצְכֶם, וְלֹא מִן הַגֵּרִים בְּאַרְצְכֶם.

However, this is difficult, as **didn't Rav Kahana say that they taught this halakha** that if one is not particular about the substance it is not considered an interposition **only** when the substance covers just a **majority of his body; but** if it covers **all of it, it is considered an interposition** by Torah law, even if he is not particular about it. The Gemara answers: **A fetus is different, as this is its natural manner of growth.**^N Its mother's womb cannot be considered an interposition, as it is the fetus' natural place of development, and therefore the fetus itself is regarded as having undergone immersion.

When Ravina came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that **Rabbi Yohanan said:** With respect to lineage, **among the other nations** of the world, i.e., while they are still gentiles, **follow the male,**^H but if they married after **they converted, follow the more flawed in lineage of the two.** The Gemara explains: **Among the nations, follow the male, as it is taught in a baraita:** **From where is it derived that if one from the other nations^N had relations with a Canaanite woman^H and had a son from her, you are permitted to purchase him as a slave, and he is not considered a Canaanite who may not be allowed to remain in Eretz Yisrael? As it is stated:** “**And also from the children of the strangers that dwell among you, of them may you buy, and of their families that are with you, which they have begotten in your land; and they may be your possession**” (Leviticus 25:45).

One might have thought that **even if one from the Canaanite nations had relations with a woman from one of the other nations and had a son from her, you are permitted to purchase him as a slave.** Therefore, **the same verse states:** “**Which they have begotten in your land,**” which indicates that slaves may be bought **only from those begotten in your land,** i.e., from those whose father was a non-Canaanite and whose mother was a Canaanite. It is the way of women to remain in their own land, and so a child born in Eretz Yisrael was certainly born to a Canaanite mother. **But slaves may not be bought from those dwelling in your land.** If a child is born to a Canaanite man and a non-Canaanite woman outside of Eretz Yisrael, and that offspring later returns to dwell in Eretz Yisrael, the offspring may not be acquired as a slave, because his lineage follows his father. He is regarded as a Canaanite, who may not be allowed to remain in Eretz Yisrael.

HALAKHA

בְּאוֹמוֹת הַלֵּךְ – אַחֵר הַזְכָּר: If a male Ammonite married a female Egyptian, their child is an Ammonite. If the male is Egyptian and the female an Ammonite, the child is an Egyptian, as with respect to gentiles the child's status is determined by the male, as stated by Ravina (*Shulḥan Arukh, Even HaEzer 4:7*).

One from the other nations had relations with a Canaanite woman – אֶחָד מִן הָאוֹמוֹת שְׂבָא עַל הַכְּנַעֲנִית: If a gentile had relations with a Canaanite maidservant belonging to a Jew, a child resulting from this union would be a Canaanite slave. However, if a Canaanite slave had relations with a gentile woman, a child from this union would not be a slave, as his status is determined by his mother's lineage (Rambam *Sefer Kinyan, Hilkhot Avadim 9:3* and *Kesef Mishne* and *Lehem Mishne* there).

NOTES

This is its growth – הֵיִנוּ רַבִּיתֶיהָ: An interposition involves an object or substance that serves as a barrier between the item or individual requiring immersion and the water. As stated above, for a substance to be considered an interposition, the one involved must be particular about it and desire its removal. However, in the case discussed here, not only is the fetus not particular about the interposition, i.e., its mother's body, but it actually wants it to be there, as it cannot survive without it. A further relevant point is that since this is the natural manner of growth of the fetus, the mother's body cannot be viewed as an interposition at all. Therefore, in light of the vital connection between a fetus and its mother's body, even if the fetus is not regarded as part of its mother, her body cannot be regarded as an interposition.

From where is it derived that if one from the other nations – מִנֵּן לְאֶחָד מִן הָאוֹמוֹת: Rashi and the Rambam disagree with regard to the basic meaning of this passage. According to Rashi the question concerns the Canaanite who is the object of the mitzva: “You shall not let any soul live” (Deuteronomy 20:16). Does the mother or the father determine the child's status in this regard? The Rambam, as explained by the *Maggid Mishne*, maintains that the question pertains to a child born to a Canaanite slave or maidservant belonging to a Jew. Is such a child considered a Canaanite slave? According to this opinion, if the mother is a maidservant the child's status is based on hers, but if it is the father who is a slave, since a slave has no lineage, the offspring's status is based on the mother, and if she is from one of the other nations, her child is considered free.

If they converted, follow the more flawed – נְתַגְיִירוּ – הלך אחר הפגום: The status of a child of converts from different nations is determined based on the more impaired of his two parents, as explained in the Gemara. Consequently, if a male Ammonite convert and a female Egyptian convert have a son, he is an Ammonite, whereas their daughter is considered an Egyptian.

If a convert from any of the nations has relations with a gentile woman, some say that their child is assigned to the mother, while others maintain that its status is determined by the more impaired of the two (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 12:20; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:7, and in the comment of Rema).

Mamzerim and Gibeonites – מְמַזְרִים וְגִבְעוֹנִים: *Mamzerim* and Gibeonites, both males and females, are permanently prohibited from entering into the congregation, against the opinion of Reish Lakish (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhoh Issurei Bia* 15:21; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 4:1).

”נְתַגְיִירוּ, הֲלֵךְ אַחַר פְּגוּם שְׁבִשְׁנֵיהֶם.”
בְּמֵאֵי פְּגוּם שְׁבִשְׁנֵיהֶם אֵיךְ בְּהָ? עֲמוּנִי
וְלֹא עֲמוּנִית! אֶלְלָא בְּעֲמוּנִי שְׁנֵשָׂא
מִצְרִית, אִי זְכָר הָיָה – שְׁדִיָּיה בְּתֵר עֲמוּנִי.
אִי נְקֵבָה הָיָה – שְׁדִיָּיה בְּתֵר מִצְרִית.

מתני' ממזרין ונתנינן אסורין, ואיסורן איסור עולם, אחד זכרים ואחד נקבות.

גמ' אמר ריש לקיש: ממזרת, לאחור עשרה דורות מותרת. לויף עשירי עשירי מעמוני ומואבי, מה להלן נקבות מותרות – אף כאן נקבות מותרות.

אי, מה להלן מיד אף כאן מיד! כי אהני גזירה שוה – מעשירי ואילך.

והאנן תנן: ממזרים ונתנינן אסורין ואיסורן איסור עולם, אחד זכרים ואחד נקבות! לא קשיא, הא – כמאן דאמר דון מינה ומינה.

It was taught above in the name of Rabbi Yohanan that if they married after they converted, follow the more flawed^h in lineage of the two. The Gemara asks: To what circumstances is this referring? If we say it is referring to a male Egyptian convert who married a female Ammonite convert, what is the meaning of: More flawed in lineage of the two, in this case? The *halakha* is that an Ammonite man is barred from entering into the congregation, but not an Ammonite woman, and so she is not flawed at all. Rather, it must be referring to a male Ammonite convert who married a female Egyptian convert. If the child is male, assign him to his Ammonite father, so that he is permanently barred from entering the congregation. If it is a female, assign her to her Egyptian mother, so that she is treated like a second-generation Egyptian convert.

MISHNA *Mamzerim* and the Gibeonites^h who converted to Judaism in the days of Joshua are prohibited from entering into the congregation and marrying a woman who was born Jewish. Their prohibition is eternal, for all generations, and it applies to both males and females.

GEMARA Reish Lakish said: A *mamzeret*, a female *mamzer*, is permitted after ten generations.^N Why? He derived this *halakha* by way of a verbal analogy between the word “tenth” stated in relation to an Ammonite and a Moabite in the verse “An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none of them enter into the congregation of the Lord forever” (Deuteronomy 23:4), and the word “tenth” stated in relation to a *mamzer* in the verse “A *mamzer* shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none of his enter into the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:3) He explained the analogy as follows: Just as below, with regard to an Ammonite and a Moabite, females are permitted, so too here, with regard to a *mamzer*, females are permitted.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: Or perhaps one should say that just as below, with regard to an Ammonite and a Moabite, their females are permitted immediately, so too here, a *mamzeret* is permitted immediately. The Gemara answers: The verbal analogy is effective only from the tenth generation and onward.

The Gemara raises another difficulty: But didn't we learn in the mishna that *mamzerim* and Gibeonites are prohibited, and their prohibition is eternal for all generations, and it applies to both males and females? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult for Reish Lakish, as he understands that there is a dispute in this regard: This opinion, that of Reish Lakish, is in accordance with the *tanna* who said that the application of a verbal analogy is extended by way of the principle: Infer from it, and again from it.^N In other words, after deducing case B from case A, all of the characteristics of case A are applied to case B. In the case discussed here, although the verbal analogy comes primarily to render a *mamzer* permanently forbidden, it is extended and understood to mean that a *mamzeret* is permitted after ten generations.

NOTES

ממזרת לאחור עשרה דורות – A mamzeret...after ten generations: In the Jerusalem Talmud Reish Lakish's opinion is attributed to a *tanna*. The Gemara here indicates likewise, as it does not reject Reish Lakish's opinion although it contradicts the mishna.

Infer from it, and again from it – דון מינה ומינה: Expositions based on verbal analogies raise many difficulties. Some of these difficulties stem from the fact that this mode of exegesis is not derived from logical reasoning but is a kind of biblical decree by which, in accordance with special indications and traditions, two verses and the *halakhot* derived from them are combined. It is an established

principle that there cannot be half a verbal analogy, and so the inferences drawn with it must be bilateral, but there is disagreement as to the extent of the comparison between the different issues. Are they equated in all regards, based on the principle of: Infer from it, and again from it, i.e., in addition to the *halakha* for which the verbal analogy was initially applied, one may proceed to derive other *halakhot* as well? Or perhaps the comparison extends to only one particular matter, based on the principle of: Infer from it, and leave it in its place, which means that the association between the two topics pertains only to the specific issue with regard to which there is a tradition.

A mamzer does not survive – ממוזר לא חיי: In the Jerusalem Talmud this is explained slightly differently and in greater detail. Rav Huna states there that a *mamzer* cannot survive for longer than thirty days. As for the possibility of generations of *mamzerim*, it is mentioned there in the name of Rav Ḥanina that once every sixty or seventy years a plague strikes the world that wipes out, among others, the *mamzerim* among the Jews.

They examined but did not find – בדקו ולא מצאו: The later authorities explain that they first thought that the drought was precisely the type that is a divine punishment for particular sins, and therefore there was no cause to inquire through the *Urim VeTummim*. However, once they realized it was not the result of a widespread sin among the people David concluded that it must be caused by a sin of the king, as he represents the entire nation. In fact, although David was not directly responsible for the sins, both in the case of Nob, the city of priests, and in the case of Saul's eulogy, he was ultimately the indirect cause for these events (see Riaz and *Iyyun Ya'akov*).

HALAKHA

The prohibition with regard to Gibeonites – איסור התנינים: According to the Rambam, by Torah law it is not prohibited for a convert from one of the seven Canaanite nations to enter into the congregation. Rather, it was Joshua who issued a decree against the Gibeonites, and therefore the prohibition with regard to them is rabbinic. This is also the opinion of Rashi and the Razah. Others (Ramban; Rashba; *Tur*) maintain that first-generation Gibeonites are forbidden by Torah law, whereas their descendants are forbidden by decree of the Sages (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Issurei Bia* 12:2).

הא כמאן דאמר דון מינה ואוקרי באתרא.

That other opinion, i.e., the mishna, is in accordance with the *tanna* who said that the application of a verbal analogy is limited, according to the principle: **Infer from it, and then leave it in its place.** That is to say, after the main provision of case A is applied to case B, case B is recognized as having its own character and specific rules that apply to it. Accordingly, in the case discussed here, the verbal analogy teaches one specific *halakha* that a *mamzer* is prohibited permanently, but nothing else.

שאלו את רבי אליעזר: ממזרת לא אחר עשרה דרי מהו? אמר להם: מי יתן לי דור שלישי ואטהרנו. אלמא קסבר ממזרא לא חיי, וכן אמר רב הונא: ממזרא לא חיי.

The Gemara relates that the students asked Rabbi Eliezer: With regard to a *mamzeret* after ten generations, what is the *halakha*? He said to them: **Who will give me a third-generation mamzer so that I will declare him pure?** The Gemara comments: **Apparently he maintains that a mamzer does not survive.**⁴ *Mamzerim* perish at the hand of Heaven, and therefore this question is not a practical one. **And similarly, Rav Huna said that a mamzer does not survive.**

והא אפני תנן: ממזרין אסורין ואיסורן איסור עולם! אמר רבי זירא: לדידי מפרשא לי מיניה דרב יהודה: דידיע – חיי, דלא ידיע – לא חיי. דידיע ולא ידיע – עד תלתא דרי חיי טפי לא חיי.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **But didn't we learn in the mishna that mamzerim are prohibited from entering into the congregation, and their prohibition is eternal** for all generations? How is this possible if they do not even live long enough to produce three generations? Rabbi Zeira said: **This matter was explained to me by Rav Yehuda himself: One who is known to be a mamzer will survive, as there is no concern that there will be any mingling of his seed. On the other hand, one who is not known as a mamzer will not survive, as he will die at the hand of Heaven so that there will be no mingling of his seed. As for one who is known and not known, i.e., one who is under suspicion, but it is unclear whether or not he is actually a mamzer, his descendants will survive for three generations, but more than this they will not survive.**

ההוא דהוי בשבבתייה דרבי אמי, אכריו עליה דממזרא הוה. בכי ואזיל. אמר ליה: חיים נתתי לך.

It is related that a certain person lived in Rabbi Ami's neighborhood, and following an investigation Rabbi Ami declared him to be a *mamzer*. The man went about weeping until Rabbi Ami said to him: **You should not be upset, as now I have given you life.** As explained above, once one is publicly known as a *mamzer*, he and his descendants may survive.

אמר רב חנא בר אדא: נתינים – דוד גזר עליהם, שנאמר "ויקרא המלך לגבעונים ויאמר אליהם והגבעונים לא מבני ישראל המה" וגו'.

§ Rav Ḥana bar Adda said: As for the Gibeonites,⁴ it was King David who decreed that they may not enter into the congregation, as it is stated: **"And the king called the Gibeonites and said to them. Now the Gibeonites are not of the children of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites"** (II Samuel 21:2). This verse indicates that it was David who ruled that they are not part of the Jewish people and that they are barred from the congregation even though they converted.

מאי טעמא גזר עלייהו – דכתוב ויהי רעב בימי דוד שלש שנים שנה אחר שנה. שנה ראשונה אמר להם: שמא עובדי עבודה זרה יש בכם דכתוב "ועבדתם אלהים אחרים והשתחוויתם להם... ונעצר את השמים ולא יהיה מטר" וגו' – בדקו ולא מצאו.

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason that David decreed that they may not enter into the congregation?** In order to answer this question, the Gemara recounts all the relevant background events. **As it is written: "And there was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year"** (II Samuel 21:1). In the first year David said to the Jewish people: **Perhaps there are idol worshippers among you, this being a sin that can lead to drought, as it is written: "Take heed to yourselves, lest your heart be deceived, and you turn aside, and serve other gods, and worship them; and the anger of the Lord is kindled against you, and He shut up the heaven, so that there shall be no rain, and the ground shall not yield her fruit"** (Deuteronomy 11:16–17). **They examined the matter but did not find**⁴ sinners of this kind.

שנה אמר להם: שמא עובדי עבודה זרה יש בכם, דכתוב "וימנעו רביבים ומלקוש לא היה ומצח אשה זונה היה לך" וגו' – בדקו ולא מצאו.

In the second year of the drought David said to them: **Perhaps there are transgressors in sexual matters among you, as this too can lead to drought, as it is written: "Therefore the showers have been withheld, and there has been no latter rain; yet you had a harlot's forehead, you refused to be ashamed"** (Jeremiah 3:3), which indicates that licentious behavior can lead to a cessation of rainfall. Again they examined the matter, **but did not find** sinners of this kind either.

מתוך שְׁהַרְג נוב עיר – He killed Nob, the city of priests – While David was fleeing from King Saul, who perceived him as a threat to his monarchy, Ahimelech, the priest in the city of Nob, offered him bread and Goliath's sword, believing him to be on a secret mission in the service of the king. Doeg the Edomite reported this to King Saul, who then ordered the destruction of the city (see I Samuel, chapters 21–22).

שְׁלִישִׁית אָמַר לָהֶם: שָׁמָּה פּוֹסְקֵי צִדְקָה
בְּרַבִּים יֵשׁ בְּכֶם וְאִין נֹתְנִין, דְּכַתִּיב
”נְשִׂאִים וְרוּחַ וְגֶשֶׁם אֵין אִישׁ מִתְהַלֵּל
בְּמַתַּת שְׁקָר” – בְּדַקּוּ וְלֹא מִצָּאוּ.

אָמַר: אֵין הַדָּבָר תְּלוּי אֱלֹא בִי, מִיָּד –
”וַיִּבְקֹשׁ דָּוִד אֶת פְּנֵי ה'” מֵאֵי הֵיא? אָמַר
רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: שְׂשָׂאֵל בְּאוּרִים וְתוּמִים.

מֵאֵי מִשְׁמַע? אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: אֲתֵיָא
”פְּנֵי” ”פְּנֵי”, כְּתִיב הֵכָּא ”וַיִּבְקֹשׁ דָּוִד אֶת
פְּנֵי ה'” וְכִתִּיב הֵתָּם ”וְשָׂאֵל לוֹ בְּמִשְׁפַּט
הָאוּרִים לְפָנֵי ה'”.

”וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֵל שָׂאוּל וְאֵל בֵּית הַדְּמִים עַל
אֲשֶׁר הִמִּית הַגִּבְעוֹנִים”. ”אֵל שָׂאוּל” –
שְׂלֵא נִסְפַּד כְּהִלְכָה, וְאֵל בֵּית הַדְּמִים –
”עַל אֲשֶׁר הִמִּית הַגִּבְעוֹנִים”. וְכִי הֵיכָן
מְצִינוּ בְּשָׂאוּל שֶׁהִמִּית הַגִּבְעוֹנִים? אֱלֹא,
מִתּוֹךְ שְׁהַרְג נוב עִיר הַכֹּהֲנִים שְׁהָיוּ
מִסְפִּיקִין לָהֶם מִים וּמוֹזֵן – מַעֲלָה עָלָיו
הַכְּתוּב בְּאֵילוֹ הַרְגָן.

קָא תְּבַע אֵל שָׂאוּל שְׂלֵא נִסְפַּד כְּהִלְכָה
וְקָא תְּבַע עַל אֲשֶׁר הִמִּית הַגִּבְעוֹנִים!
אֵין, דְּאָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: מֵאֵי דְכַתִּיב
”בְּקִשׁוֹ אֶת ה' כָּל עֲנֵיו אֲרָץ אֲשֶׁר מִשְׁפָּטוֹ
פָּעִלוּ”, בְּאֲשֶׁר מִשְׁפָּטוֹ – שָׁם פָּעִלוּ.

אָמַר דָּוִד: שָׂאוּל נִפְקוּ לְהוּ

In the third year he said to them: Perhaps there are among you those who pledge money to charity in public, but do not actually give any charity. As it is written: “As vapors and wind without rain, so is he that boasts himself of a false gift” (Proverbs 25:14), teaching that one who falsely boasts of making a gift prevents the rain from falling. Once again they examined the matter, but could not find such sinners.

Having unsuccessfully searched the Jewish people for sins that cause drought, David said: The matter depends on nothing other than myself. Immediately it is stated: “And David sought the presence of the Lord” (I Samuel 21:1). The Gemara asks: What is this? How did David seek God? Reish Lakish said: He inquired through the *Urim VeTummim*, the stones embedded in the High Priest's breastplate, which served as a means of communicating with God.

The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that David's seeking was by way of the *Urim VeTummim*? Rabbi Elazar said: This is derived by way of a verbal analogy between the word “presence” used here and the word “presence” used elsewhere. It is written here: “And David sought the presence of the Lord,” and it is written there: “And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the *Urim* in the presence of the Lord” (Numbers 27:21). Consequently, the “presence of the Lord” sought by David must have involved the *Urim VeTummim*.

The verse continues: “And the Lord said: It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he put to death the Gibeonites” (I Samuel 21:1). The Gemara explains: “For Saul” means that the Jewish people were punished because he was not eulogized properly.^N “And for his bloody house” is “because he put to death the Gibeonites.” The Gemara is puzzled by this explanation: Now, where do we find that Saul put to death the Gibeonites? The Gemara clarifies: Rather, because he killed^N the people of Nob, the city of priests,^B who would provide the Gibeonites with water and food in exchange for their services, the verse ascribes to him as if he himself had killed them.

The Gemara questions this understanding: On one hand, God demands retribution because Saul was not eulogized properly, while on the other hand, He demands retribution because Saul himself put to death the Gibeonites. The Gemara answers: Yes, this is how it should be. As Reish Lakish said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Seek the Lord, all the humble of the earth, that have executed [*pa'alu*] His justice” (Zephaniah 2:3)? Where mention is made of the justice to be carried out against a person, his good deeds [*pa'alo*] should be mentioned there as well.

David said: With regard to the eulogy for Saul, there have already passed

NOTES

שָׂאוּל שְׂלֵא נִסְפַּד – Saul, because he was not eulogized properly – The Maharatz Hayyut points out that Saul is the only king for whom a great and lengthy eulogy is recorded, delivered by David himself (see I Samuel, chapter I). Rather, the Gemara means that Saul was not eulogized properly because David's eulogy, due to its very length and poetic style, was that of one private individual for another private individual; it was inappropriate for a king of Israel.

The later authorities note that although the verse does not mention the lack of honor paid to Saul, this misconduct can be inferred from the fact that David later brought the bones of Saul and his sons and buried them in a dignified manner in their ancestral graves.

אֱלֹא מִתּוֹךְ שְׁהַרְג – Rather because he killed – In the Jerusalem Talmud in tractate *Kiddushin* it is stated that Saul did in fact kill seven Gibeonites in the course of his destruction of Nob, which is why they asked for seven of his own sons in return. The Maharsha suggests that it was the Gibeonites who had provided the priests with food and water and that they were upset now that they were deprived of this sacred service.

As for the entire people being held responsible for the sin committed by Saul, the Rifa explains that since all of the Jewish people swore to safeguard the Gibeonites' lives and welfare, any suffering of the Gibeonites was a desecration of God's name. Therefore, the restitution to them was also exaggerated in order to sanctify the name of God.